













INTRODUCTION TO THE FIFTH BOOK OF  
HOOKER'S TREATISE OF THE LAWS  
OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY

*PAGET*

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.

PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



LONDON, EDINBURGH, AND NEW YORK

AN INTRODUCTION  
TO THE  
FIFTH BOOK OF HOOKER'S TREATISE  
OF THE  
LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY

BY  
THE VERY REV. FRANCIS PAGET, D.D.  
DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH

Oxford  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

MDCCCXCIX



DILECTISSIMÆ  
CONJUGI



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE .....	ix
CHAPTER I. THE CHARACTER OF HOOKER'S WRITINGS AND WORK.....	1
CHAPTER II. THE PURITAN POSITION .....	8
CHAPTER III. THE LIFE OF HOOKER .....	79
CHAPTER IV. THE PREFACE TO THE TREATISE, AND THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS .....	90
I. THE PREFACE .....	91
II. BOOK I .....	99
III. BOOK II .....	103
IV. BOOK III .....	106
V. BOOK IV .....	120
CHAPTER V. THE FIFTH BOOK .....	123
A. BOOK V. CHAPTERS I-IV .....	126
B. CHAPTERS V-X.....	128
C. CHAPTERS XI-XVII.....	130
D. CHAPTERS XVIII-XXII.....	132
E. CHAPTERS XXIII-XLIX .....	138
F. CHAPTERS L-LVII .....	147
G. CHAPTER LVIII-LXV.....	163
H. CHAPTER LXVI .....	171
I. CHAPTERS LXVII, LXVIII .....	172

	PAGE
CHAPTER V. THE FIFTH BOOK ( <i>continued</i> ).	
J. CHAPTERS LXIX-LXXII .....	186
K. CHAPTERS LXXIII-LXXV .....	192
L. CHAPTERS LXXVI-LXXXI .....	192
CHAPTER VI. THE SEQUEL OF THE FIFTH BOOK .....	207
CHAPTER VII. THE OUTCOME OF HOOKER'S WORK.....	222
APPENDIX I. KNOX, GILBY, GOODMAN, AND WHITTINGHAM .....	231
APPENDIX II. THE PARLIAMENTS OF 1566 AND 1571 .....	236
APPENDIX III. DISCIPLINA ECCLESIAE SACRA.....	238
APPENDIX IV. A BOOKE OF THE FORME OF COMMON PRAYERS, ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS, &C., AGREEABLE TO GOD'S WORDE, AND THE USE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES .....	252
APPENDIX V. THE EDITIONS OF HOOKER'S TREATISE OF THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY .....	256
APPENDIX VI. HACKET'S CONSPIRACY .....	260
APPENDIX VII. THE LAST THREE BOOKS OF THE TREATISE, AND THE OPUSCULA .....	262

## PREFACE

---

IN 1887 the Delegates of the University Press offered to entrust to me the preparation of a separate Edition of the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. It had been hoped that Dean Church would add to his admirable edition of the First Book, and to his revision of Mr. Keble's great work, this further help in the study of Hooker. It was when he judged it necessary to resign the task that it passed into my hands; and this volume contains such partial fulfilment as I have been able to give to an undertaking formally made in 1888.

At that time I was lecturing on Hooker: a few of the pages here printed were written for the lectures: and I thought the work I had undertaken would be finished in two or three years. I should exceed even the licence enjoyed by egotism in a Preface if I tried to tell the hindrances or own the faults which have nearly stretched the two or three years into twelve. I will only say that there have been hindrances as well as faults: and that I think the misfortune of having to lay one's task aside, and let it lie untouched, for weeks and months of business far removed from it, can only be realized through experience. The references that seemed securely luminous, the plans one thought one had thought out, the fragments that had promised to cohere, relapse into obscurity and confusion: time after time one has almost to start afresh, with a dwindling capacity for freshness, and with a growing dread of blunders: since it is hard to make sure of thoroughness and accuracy where work is intermittent and lacks the long spells of thought and study that have the best chance

of getting at the truth.—And so it is with uneasiness and a sense of manifold failure that I send out this volume. But perhaps it may help some one else to do what I meant to do.

I have been revising the proofs through days of hot debate and much anxiety in the Church of England: and here and there passages in the book have seemed to me to bear somewhat plainly on the present troubles. And so it may not be impertinent to say that I am not conscious of having written a single sentence with any such reference in my mind. Whatever lessons or warnings the words convey rise simply, I hope, out of the past, where any one, I think, may find them.

The material which it seemed necessary to bring into an Introduction to Hooker's Fifth Book grew as one looked at it: and so the Introduction reached the measure of an independent volume. Simultaneously with it the Delegates are issuing as a separate volume Mr. Keble's Edition of the Fifth Book, as revised in 1888, with the correction of some faults then left uncorrected.

I owe many debts of gratitude in regard to these pages:—and I fear it may be among the evil results of interrupted work that I have failed to own some such debts. But I cannot fail to render thanks to the Delegates of the University Press for their apparently inexhaustible patience and considerateness: to Mr. C. E. Doble for his willing attention to my difficulties in the preparation of the volume: to Dr. Bright, for the guidance and encouragement given me by his invaluable counsel: and to Dr. Moberly and Mr. Hassall, who have added to the help and kindness of many years yet another token of true friendship in their revision and criticism of my work.

FRANCIS PAGET.

# INTRODUCTION TO THE FIFTH BOOK OF HOOKER'S TREATISE OF THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.



## CHAPTER I.

### *The character of Hooker's writings and work.*

THE rare power of Richard Hooker's mind and the enduring value of his work have caused his name to be, perhaps, more widely known than that of any other English theologian. But the qualities which make his life and writings singularly well worth careful study are of diverse kinds: for behind what has made him famous there are traits which make him really great; and to gifts which very few have ever rivalled he added excellences which almost all might imitate. It may be well, then, to indicate briefly at the outset of this Introduction some of the distinctive characteristics of his work and of his mind, that they may serve to mark the ways by which may come the chief advantages of taking pains to understand him. There seem to be three aspects in which he may be studied: the aspects of style, of theology, and of conduct; and in each aspect there is seen in him much that is very rare, and also something, at least, that may be imitated or pursued by most men.

(1) Hooker may be regarded, first, as holding a conspicuous place in the history of English literature. It has been claimed for his great book that "it first revealed to the nation what English prose might be<sup>1</sup>." In its dignity and strength, its self-restraint and courage, his style seems like the work of those architects

<sup>1</sup> R. W. Church, Introduction to Hooker, Book I. p. xix. Cf. Id., Spenser, p. 4, "The grandeur and  
"force of English prose began in  
"Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity."

who first gave full developement to the principle of the pointed arch, and realized the new powers which their art thus gained. Liberty and grace and loftiness are there; while pride and luxury have not begun as yet to touch the work or threaten its simplicity of purpose. It is likely that educated men of the Elizabethan age had a high standard of literary excellence; but they owned the singular distinction of Hooker's language. Some of his adversaries, indeed, made it a matter of complaint against him, that his books were "in a stile not usuall, and, as we verilie "think, the like harde to be found<sup>1</sup>"; but others, who would as resolutely have repudiated his teaching, were able to recognize his style as one "that expressed such a grave and so humble "a majesty, with such clear demonstration of reason, that in all "their readings they had not met with any that exceeded him<sup>2</sup>." Subsequent criticism, or common sense, may be trusted to decide between these divergent estimates of the difference which severed Hooker's manner from the ordinary prose of controversy—it is significant enough that even those who censured him felt that somehow he stood apart, and that later ages have looked back to him as eminent even in the period of Spenser, of Shakespeare, and of Bacon.

In wealth and stateliness and strength of diction Hooker stands indisputably in the very first rank of English writers; but there are also humbler and more imitable characteristics to be studied in his ways of self-expression. It is impossible not to admire the courage with which he uses the word which will most vividly and concisely tell his meaning, even though it may be a word of homely associations or unacademic form<sup>3</sup>. Again, he was wise and firm to cut out ruthlessly a sentence which was

<sup>1</sup> A Christian Letter, p. 45. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 46, 47. "In your writing we are "mightily encumbered, we walk as in "a labyrinth, and are suddenly overwhelmed as in the deep sea." "We desire you, . . . that if you set forth "your other books which are promised, you would be more plain and "sensible; and follow the usual language and style of other learned "men and English writers; leaving "out unnecessary long discourses "and common places, set out your

"reasons in plain terms and words "of sincerity, without these huge "embossments or stuffed bombasting." (Quoted in Hanbury's Hooker, ii. 446.) Cf. Keble's Hooker, vol. i. p. cxx.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Stapleton, to Clement VIII. Walton's Life, in Keble's Hooker, i. 71.

<sup>3</sup> e. g. "Mel-pell," "Mingle-mangle," "pew-fellows," "spit-venom," "trencher-mates."

striking or brilliant rather than certainly and exactly just: for there is a contrast in this regard between the rough notes of his intended answer to the Christian Letter<sup>1</sup> and his finished writing; some of the corrections made on the first draft of his Fifth Book seem prompted by the same loyalty to truth and charity, the same watchful care to guard his work from the harmful influence of debate<sup>2</sup>; and what is extant of the last three Books, having lacked his final revision, shows a sharpness and pugnacity which was kept down more strictly in the work that he himself let go into the world. But he is admirable above all in his sustained, painstaking resoluteness to make clear exactly what he means. In regard to some points, indeed, his meaning has been much discussed and cannot easily be ascertained<sup>3</sup>; but the difficulty seems mainly due to the tangle of his day, and to the impossibility of getting quietude enough for a clear sight and a fair hearing while in the spheres alike of thought and action things were in a state of stormy and perilous transition. Hooker's language may be inconsistent where his mind had not perfectly steadied itself among the vehement and conflicting tendencies of that tumultuous age; and it may seem obscure if his reader is unable or unwilling to read slowly and to take pains; but (in all the work that he was able to prepare for publication) the obscurity is the obscurity of depth and not of turbidness. No trouble has been grudged to find the words that may exactly tell the thought, in all its fullness and with all its necessary qualification; and in the present day, when not only he who reads must run, but also he who writes is generally running too, there is a wholesome discipline and also an unusual satisfaction to be found in studying an author whose every sentence has been thoroughly and conscientiously thought out, who is never slovenly or tautologous, and for whose work the most noble language seems somehow the most serviceable and appropriate.

---

(2) Of Hooker's position as a theologian, of the distinctive notes of his mind and work in this regard, it is impossible to

<sup>1</sup> For an account of the Christian Letter cf. *infra*, pp. 207-211.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the erasures on pp. 422, 468, 503, cited in the account of the

Bodleian MS. prefixed to Book V.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Keble's Hooker, Editor's Preface, §§ 29 seq.

speak at once with brevity and with anything like completeness ; but three traits may be taken as sufficient to suggest how well he will requite whatever care is given to him.

(a) For, in the first place, with him the glow and life of truth is never lost in the precision of its treatment. There seems to be in many minds a conviction that accuracy and coldness necessarily go together : that if truth is exactly stated it must be of course dry and probably dull. Hooker stands with not a few other writers of exact theology to disprove any such imagination. His lines of definition are drawn with a firm, deliberate hand ; into sentences concise as epigrams he puts the perfect expression of unalterable truths ; the words so closely fit the truth that one tries in vain to condense or to abridge a single phrase in a whole paragraph or chapter. It is mere and unalloyed and undecorated doctrine, but all the while it throbs with an intense life, and it can outglow the most fervid peroration for all who appreciate the grandeur and the appeal of sheer reality and strong self-restraint. It is the prerogative of a mind that has profoundly realized the truth to be able to convey it to others accurately, without abatement or addition, as needing no force to bear it home, no fire to enkindle it, no life to make it vivid in men's hearts, save that which it supplies itself, because it is the truth : and this prerogative may certainly be claimed for Hooker.

(b) With this the second trait is closely linked. The demands of constant controversy never attenuate or obscure for Hooker the real import of the doctrines with which he has to deal ; he never forgets that the great truths which he defends are the truths which sustain the whole fabric of his hope ; his own personal relation to that which he urges upon others seems to be always in his mind. And thus he is lifted above some of the worst dangers of theological debate. He never handles truths like chessmen with which his adversary's pieces may be got into a corner, or like weapons with which an assailant may be driven in discredit from the field. There is in him a reverent chivalry towards the teaching for which he contends ; and so he makes his readers think far more of the truth than of its champion, far more of its greatness than of his skill, and the truth is only gaining vividness and splendour and authority while he is fighting for it ;—he shows its beauty as he proves its strength.

(c) And thus there is this other quality to be noted in his work; that though three centuries have passed since it was done, it still seems strangely fresh, still bears with real relevance and force on modern questions and difficulties. The problems of this last decade of the nineteenth century are widely different from those which agitated most men's thoughts in the corresponding years of the sixteenth; but again and again it seems as though men now might see things more justly and more hopefully, in a clearer light and with less disproportion, if they could look at them in Hooker's way, from his standpoint and with his temper. Here and there one comes upon a passage which might even be taken just as it is for the best answer to some question which is being asked to-day; but constantly one feels that Hooker, as he deals with his own task, is placing the reader at exactly the right point from which to deal with his, and that Hooker's way goes very straight and very far towards piercing his reader's difficulties; so that one can hardly fail to find that the light is growing clearer, if one pushes on where he is pointing. It is strange to think how many and how deep have been the changes in the subjects and the methods of men's thinking since the years when Hooker was at work on his great book, to think how far from the controversy with which he was busy lie the characteristic problems of this age, and then to feel how real is the help he has to offer towards their solution, how confidently we can say what line he would be taking if he were here to deal with them. It has been said of great dramatic conceptions, of characters such as *Æschylus* and *Shakespeare* have summoned into life, that their power is not spent in their first use, that they might be carried into conditions wholly different from those in which the poet has displayed them, and that there they still would be themselves and take their proper part<sup>1</sup>. There seems to be some like power of sustained energy and freshness in the highest work of speculative or constructive thought, in the arguments that are not expedients but achievements. They have an inner force and value of their own, apart from all the circumstances amidst which their first effect was felt; they win their triumph over the pretensions against which

<sup>1</sup> J. A. Symonds, *The Greek Poets*, Series II. pp. 169, 170.

they were sent out, and then return to strengthen and secure the course of learning; and when all is changed around them, they have still their place and power in men's lives; their power to encourage and to educate, to sustain expectancy and point the way of effort; their power, above all, to keep up the standard of thoroughness and perseverance, and to make men rightly distrustful of all that is easy, self-satisfied, or superficial <sup>1</sup>.

(3) As a writer of English, then, and as a guide of thought, Hooker may teach lessons which men are not ceasing yet to need. And lastly, in himself, as illustrating the best way to live and work in a time of much controversy and confusion, he is singularly well worth studying. Since some account of his life will have to be given later in this Introduction, it would be out of place here to speak of his character at any length; for it may best be seen in the course he held. But two traits stand out in it so brightly that they may, perhaps, be brought in here for special emphasis. They are his persevering diligence in his own proper work, and his pure unworldliness. It will presently be seen how vehement and ceaseless was the great controversy with which he had to do (a controversy, be it remembered, in which neither side would ever have been content with any recognition or liberty which was equally conceded to the other); and it will be seen how Hooker was placed in the very front of the struggle, to contend in the full publicity of London life, at a centre of its keenest interest, with one of the strongest and best men in the Puritan party. But no excitement of conflict and no exultation in advantage ever drew him away from his great work and longing: the work of a student, and the longing for fuller knowledge of the truth. He had won his way to the student's life through many difficulties—through poverty, such as made him in his undergraduate time dependent on the liberality of one patron after another; through the vexations of academic quarrels; through ill-health; through the manifold hindrances of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mgr. Isoard, *Cinq Années*, p. 25, on the wisdom of choosing one great book for the purpose of discipline in thinking: "Il vous mettra dans une heureuse incapacité de

"vous contenter désormais de ce qui n'est qu'ébauche et superficie; il vous donnera le goût, la passion de la pensée pleine et intégrale."

an unhappy home :—and to the labours of a student he gave himself with unceasing eagerness. It is utterly astonishing to look at the list of the books which he uses in his work<sup>1</sup>, and at the exacting thoroughness of his extant writings ; to think of the vast amount of his labour of which no trace remains ; and to remember that he was only forty-seven when he died. He adds indeed the challenge of a high example to the words in which he speaks of diligence and industry as the first duty of an educated man in days of strife ; but even more impressive than his splendid dutifulness in this regard is the simplicity with which he keeps himself unspotted alike from the conflicts and from the honours of the world. When he was called into prominence he came forward and did his best ; when the trust he bore made fighting necessary, he did not flinch from it—he held his ground, watchfully, skilfully, steadily, honourably ; being in the quarrel he “ bore it that the “opposed might beware of him” : bore it without either bluster or timidity : owning always the sincerity and virtue of his adversary, and from him receiving as generous a tribute of esteem. But he loved neither fighting nor prominence : neither gave him any pleasure : and therefore neither did him any harm. There is a clear ring of genuineness in the words which Walton records as conveying Hooker’s petition to the Archbishop to remove him from the great place he held as Master of the Temple, and to send him once more to the quiet and obscurity of a country parsonage<sup>2</sup>. It is rare to see a man still young (for Hooker was but thirty-eight when he resigned the Mastership) turning away from a sphere where he has borne a brilliant part, and betaking himself into comparative seclusion, with the simple and unselfish desire only to do before he dies as much as he can of that which he believes to be his proper task. But it is perhaps even more rare for the heat of controversy to kindle in a man the desire not to talk but to think. And in both ways the example of Hooker’s life may claim as much attention as the strength of his theology and the grandeur of his style.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Index of authorities quoted.  
Keble’s Hooker, vol. iii. pp. 730–736.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble’s Hooker, vol. i. pp. 66–68.

## CHAPTER II.

### *The Puritan Position.*

IN the preceding pages an attempt has been made to sketch the distinctive excellence, in workmanship, in thought, in character, of one who stands indisputably eminent, if not supreme, amongst the theologians of the English Church in the reign of Elizabeth. It seems convenient that this should be followed by some account of that great movement which in Hooker's day agitated more or less the minds of most men and women in England, which brought on Hooker the imperious demand of a controversy from which he could not stand aloof, and which led to the production of his chief work.

No one can reach a complete or confident view of a man's work till he has realized what were the activities astir around it, the influences that shaped and penetrated it, the moral and intellectual atmosphere in which it was done. But it would be overbold to try, within the limits of this Introduction, to describe with any pretence of adequacy the characteristics of the age in which Hooker lived and wrote, or the conditions which told upon his work. The very mention of the Elizabethan age raises in the mind a picture of richness and energy and enterprise and conflict such as may hardly rise at the name of any other period in English history ; and the picture, as one stays to look at it, seems continually more complex and astonishing. It was indeed a time of great men, great perils, and great beginnings ; a time, at least in some regards, of strange confusion and inconsistent hopes : a time which for the splendour of the work that was done in it has been compared with the age of Pericles at Athens. It might be a life's task for any man to appreciate fully and to portray with exact justice the character of any one among those many streams of thought and effort which entered into the course of affairs in Elizabeth's eventful reign ; and perhaps that

queen's own mind might prove as puzzling and as important a subject for patient study as could easily be found<sup>1</sup>. But to think at all about one's own times is enough to make one feel the rashness of writing briefly or confidently about the distinctive notes and tendencies of times long past and full of problems. It would be possible, indeed, to gather together from various writers a number of thoughtful and suggestive comments upon different aspects of the age to which Hooker's work belongs. But such comments are in danger of being misused when they are taken out of their context; they generally need such qualification as cannot be condensed; they seldom mean for the reader exactly what they meant for the student who first framed them after years of study, and saw every word, it may be, in an atmosphere which he hardly realized the impossibility of sharing with others. All, then, that will be attempted here will be to delineate the position which stood over against Hooker's in the chief religious controversy of his day: the position which was before his gaze as he conceived and wrote his treatise *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. The position was that of the Puritans, and it will be here presented, so far as is possible, in the language of their own most important and deliberate utterances. In altercation men often do themselves as much injustice as they do others, and the Puritans of Hooker's time may be unfairly dealt with if they are judged by the controversial language either of their opponents or of the less sober among themselves. But it may be hoped that there will be less danger of unfairness if the statement of their opinions and demands is based upon documents which were put forward or generally recognized as the corporate expression of their position—their *platform*, in the classical sense of the word—documents which proceeded from, or were openly accepted by, men who would have been ranked among their leaders in that period. That such a rank was held by Thomas Cartwright and Walter Travers can hardly be disputed.

<sup>1</sup> For some while the late Dean of St. Paul's had meant to write a book upon Elizabeth's policy, and it was with much reluctance that he forewent the work in deference to other claims upon his time. Cf. Mr. Gladstone's

interesting essay, in his *Later Gleanings*, pp. 181 seq., especially pp. 211-218; W. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 425; and Bp. Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth*, pp. 170, 171.

It may be well to explain and justify the use of the title *Puritans*, lest any one should think that this attempt justly to describe the position of Hooker's antagonists begins with the discourtesy and injustice of wantonly giving them a nickname. A nickname it undoubtedly was in Hooker's day and long afterwards, and those to whom it was applied disclaimed it earnestly, in its current connotation. Fuller, whose account is accepted by Neal<sup>1</sup>, says that the term came into use in 1564, in connexion with the resistance offered to the stronger action then being taken to enforce conformity.

"The English Bishops," he says, "conceiving themselves impowered by their Canons, began to shew their authority in urging the Clergy of their Diocess to subscribe to the Liturgie, Ceremonies and Discipline of the Church, and such as refused the same were branded with the odious name of Puritans.

"A name which in this notion first began in this year, and the grief had not been great, if it had ended in the same. The Philosopher banisheth the term (which is *polysemon*) that is subject to several senses, out of the Predicaments, as affording too much covert for cavill by the latitude thereof. On the same account could I wish that the word Puritan were banished common discourse, because so various in the acceptions thereof. We need not speak of the ancient Cathari or Primitive Puritans, sufficiently known by their Heretical opinions. Puritan here was taken for the Opposers of the Hierarchie and Church-service, as resenting of superstition. But prophane mouths quickly improved this Nickname, therewith on every occasion to abuse pious people, some of them so far from opposing the Liturgie, that they endeavoured (according to the instructions thereof in the preparation to the Confession) to accompany the Minister with a *pure* heart, and laboured (as it is in the Absolution) for a life *pure* and holy. We will therefore decline the word to prevent exceptions, which if casually slipping from our pen, the Reader knoweth that only Non-conformists are thereby intended<sup>2</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> History of Dissenters, vol. i. Preface, p. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller, Church History of Britain, bk. ix. sect. i. §§ 66, 67. Cf. for an interesting point about the later use of the word, bk. x. sect. vi. § 18. Somewhat similarly in A Discourse concerning Puritans, tending to a Vindication of those that unjustly

suffer by the mistake, abuse, and misapplication of that Name (J. Ley, 1641) it is said, "Dissent in Ecclesiastical Policie about Ceremonies and other smaller matters, being not of the Substance of Religion, first gave occasion to raise this reproachfull word *Puritan* in the Church."

It is very likely that, as Archdeacon Hardwick suggests<sup>1</sup>, the name may have come into use rather later than Fuller thought; and that the year 1566, when the Book of Advertisements, printed in 1564, was at length published<sup>2</sup>, may have brought it into prominence<sup>3</sup>. Anyhow, it was in full currency by 1572, when the writers of the first Admonition to the Parliament protest against those who "Slanderously charge pore men (whom they have "made pore) with greivous faults, calling them Puritanes, worse "than the Donatistes<sup>4</sup>," and Whitgift, answering the Admonition, argues, "This name Puritan is very aptely given to these men, "not bycause they be pure no more than were the Heretiks "called *Cathari*<sup>5</sup>, but bycause they thinke themselves to be "*mundiores cæteris*, more pure than others, as Cathari dyd, and "seperate themselves from all other Churches and congregations "as spotted and defyled. Bicause also they suppose the Church "whiche they have devised, to be without all impuritie<sup>6</sup>."

Cartwright's reply to these words is sober and reasonable; and as coming from a representative writer, and touching a note which was often repeated, it may here be quoted at full length—

"The purenesse that we boast of is the innocencie of our Saviour "Christ, who shall cover all our unpurenesse, and not impute it unto "us. And for so much as fayth purifyeth the hart, we doubt not, but "God of his goodnes hath begon our sanctification, and hope that he "will make an ende of it, even untill the day of our Lord Jesus.

"Albeit we holde dyvers poyntes more purely then they doe, which "impugne them: yet I know none that by comparison, hath eyther said "or written that all those that thinke as we doe in those poyntes are "more holy and more unblameable in life than any of those that thinke "otherwise. If we say, that (in those poynts which we holde from "them) we thinke soundlier than they doe: we are ready to prove it.

<sup>1</sup> Hardwick, Church History: Reformation, p. 233.

<sup>2</sup> Strype, Life of Archbishop Parker, bk. ii. ch. 20, bk. iii. ch. 9; cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 233, 271-274; Cardwell, Documentary Annals, vol. i. p. 287.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the passage from Camden, quoted in Prothero's Statutes and Constitutional Documents, p. 195.

<sup>4</sup> Admonition to the Parliament, p. 2.

<sup>5</sup> In the 2nd ed. (anno 1573) is added a parenthesis, "that is, "Puritanes." A glance at the history of the Cathari will show why the implication of any likeness to them was justly resented. Cf. e.g. Sabatier, Vie de S. François d'Assise, pp. 46 seq.

<sup>6</sup> Works of Archbp. Whitgift, Parker Society ed., i. 171. Cf. An Answer to a Certen Libell (ed. 1573), p. 42.

"If we say also that we live not so offensively to the world commonly, "by getting so many lyvinges into our handes, as would finde foure or "five good learned able ministers, all the worlde will beare us witnes. "Other purenes we take not upon us. And therefore, as the name "was first by the Papistes maliciously invented<sup>1</sup>: so is it of you very "unbrotherly confirmed. Whereas you say, that they are Puritanes "which suppose the Church that they have devised to be without all "impuritie: if you meane without sinne, you doe notably slaunder them, "and it is already answered: if you meane that those are Puritanes or "Catharans which do set forth a true and perfect patern or platforme "of reforming the Church, then the marke of thys heresy reacheth unto "those which made the booke of common prayer, which you say is "a perfect and absolute rule to govern this Church, wherein nothing is "wanting or too little, nor nothing running over nor too much. As "for the Catharans (which were the same that are otherwise called "Novatians) I know no such opynion they had, and they whome you "charge are as farre from their corruption as you be<sup>2</sup>."

Walter Travers, who was probably second only to Cartwright in authority and influence among the Puritans, draws a like distinction in regard to the name, and takes like exception to its ordinary use<sup>3</sup>: and it is disclaimed as "an odious name, neither "rightly applied nor rightly understood," in *The Complaint* presented to the right Honorable the Lords of her Majesty's Privy Council<sup>4</sup>, and also in *A petition* directed to her most excellent Majestic, "unless in that sence all the Apostles (save

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *A Discourse concerning Puritans*, by J. Ley, 1641. "When "Sanders the Cōripheus of Catholicks "had slily pinned the name of "Puritans upon all such as were "most forward in encouraging, and "courageous in opposing, Catho- "liques." Cf. N. Sanderus, *De Visibili Monarchiā Ecclesiæ*, p. 709 (ed. 1571); *Id.*, *de Schismate Anglicano*, p. 188 (ed. 1585). The name is put into the mouth of the Papist in J. Rhodes' *Answer to a Romish Rhyme* (anno 1602):—

"Many & sundry sects appeare  
"Now in the world, both farre & neere;

"The Protestant, the Puritan,  
"The Calvinist, and Zwinglian."  
*Select Poetry*, pub. by Parker Society,

p. 268. Cf. also W. B. Rye, *England as seen by Foreigners*, p. 111.

<sup>2</sup> Cartwright's *Repye to an Answer* made of Doctor Whitgifte, pp. 24, 25. Published without date, probably in 1573. Whitgift in his *Defense of the Aunswere* dwells on the bitter spirit of separation shown by some of the Puritans, and disowns the extreme claim in regard to the Prayer Book which Cartwright had imputed to him (pp. 74, 75, ed. 1574). Cartwright in his *Second Reply* (1575) seems to pass over this topic.

<sup>3</sup> *An Answer to a Supplicatorie Epistle of G. T. for the pretended Catholiques*, pp. 360, 361.

<sup>4</sup> Printed in *Part of a Register*, p. 129.

"Judas) and all other true Christians are called Katharoi or "Puritans in the Scriptures<sup>1</sup>."

Meanwhile the word was taken up as an apt term of abuse by those who, without caring much about the religious difference which it indicated, resented anything which seemed to threaten the introduction of a higher standard of life and conduct. Sir Andrew Aguecheek does not define his "reason good enough" for bragging that if he thought Malvolio was a Puritan he'd "beat him like a dog<sup>2</sup>"; but it seems clear that the reason was ethical rather than theological, and that Sir Andrew's resentment was of the same sort with that noticed some forty years after *Twelfth Night* was written :

"In the Mouth of a Drunkard, he is a Puritan which refuseth his cups: in the Mouth of a Swearer, he which fears an oath: in the Mouth of a Libertine, he which makes any scruple of common sins: in the Mouth of a rude soldier, he which wisheth the Scotch war at an end without blood<sup>3</sup>."

The name, then, was a nickname in Hooker's time and long after his death. It was indeed accepted with a gloss, and sometimes it seems to be adopted without any protest<sup>4</sup> by those to whom it would have been applied by their opponents: but for the most part it was given in dislike or scorn, and rejected with indignation<sup>5</sup>. It may seem, therefore, an inappropriate and discourteous term to use: but two reasons seem valid in its justification. The first is that there is no other title that can claim to be preferred to it. For the other two names which seem to have been current about the same time, *Precisians*<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> P. 53. Cf. King James, βασιλικὸν Δῶρον, Preface to the Reader.

<sup>2</sup> *Twelfth Night*, act ii. sc. 3. Cf. for earlier passages indicating something of a liketemper Marlowe, *Doctor Faustus*, sc. 2, l. 26, with Prof. A. W. Ward's interesting note.

<sup>3</sup> A Discourse concerning Puritans, p. 59. (The writer is indebted to Prof. C. A. Briggs for the knowledge of this curious book.)

<sup>4</sup> It is, apparently, so used several times in Martin Mar-prelate's *Epistle* (1588). A striking picture is drawn

in a tract entitled *The Character of an Old English Puritane, or Non-Conformist*, by John Gere. Published according to order, 1646.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. a letter from Sampson, Dean of Christ Church, to Grindal, Archbishop of York, given in Strype's *Life of Parker*, Appendix, No. xciv, p. 179.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 377, 472. Sir Thomas Overbury (murdered in 1613) gives separate characters of "a Puritane" and "a Precisian," but with no real distinction, and little that is of value.

and Disciplinarians<sup>1</sup>, are open more or less to the same objection which lies against the name Puritans; while the latter of the two (which would have the advantage of designating the party by their most prominent demand in Hooker's day) seems never to have been in very general use, has long ceased to be a familiar word, and would assign to them the whole credit of a desire for improvement which was shared by many of their opponents<sup>2</sup>. The second reason for entitling them Puritans is that the name has found acceptance with their most congenial and laudatory historians. Indeed, Mr. Neal's entire adoption of the term<sup>3</sup> may be said to have lifted it from the air of controversy into that of history; and his example in using it seems to have been generally followed by later writers of like sympathies.

For the student of Hooker the word has an especial convenience: for it came to the front at the same time with the men whom Hooker had to resist, and with that aspect or presentation of their position which confronted him as he wrote. In the later years of Hooker's boyhood and during the years of his undergraduate life, a manifold change was passing over the movement which then began to be called Puritan. New men were beginning to take the lead, new demands were beginning to receive the chief emphasis, and before long new methods of warfare were beginning to be used. But it may be well, before trying to show the outcome of this change, to point to the causes which prepared for it and provoked it.

Puritanism has been described as conceived in the days of King Edward; born "in the reign of Queen Mary (but beyond sea "at Frankfort)"; nursed and weaned in the reign of Queen Elizabeth<sup>4</sup>. The description is suggestive and fairly just; but it was a very lusty and hopeful infant that was brought from the lands of its birth and exile when Elizabeth came to the throne.

<sup>1</sup> Or Disciplinaries. Cf. Rogers on the Thirty-Nine Articles (anno 1585), pp. 271, 280 (Parker Society ed.). "The Disciplinaries (usually termed "Puritans)." On p. 281 they are called "the Disciplinarian Puritans."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially The Canons for Discipline, given in Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. i. pp. 111 seq.

<sup>3</sup> In the title of his book, The

History of the Puritans, or Protestant Non-Conformists, and throughout its pages. Cf. his Preface, p. vii (ed. 1793).

<sup>4</sup> The metaphor is Fuller's (bk. vii. § 23), but he, in accordance with his dislike of the word *Puritanism*, speaks of *Nonconformity*. Cf. also Hooker's Preface, ii. 10.

The Brief Discourse<sup>1</sup> of the Troubles begun at Frankfort in Germany, Ann. Dom. 1554, about the Book of Common Prayer and Ceremonies, and continued by the Englishmen there to the end of Q. Mary's Reign discloses, amidst much that is curious and dreary, a strong tenacity of conviction and a deficient sense of proportion on the part of many who were then in banishment and who returned to England on Elizabeth's accession; and such tenacity and deficiency are important elements in a religious movement. The treatise *How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects* was written by Christopher Goodman and furnished with a commendatory epistle by William Whittingham; both these were of the Puritans with whom Archbishop Parker had to deal; and their treatise sufficiently shows the temper in which they and those who learnt of them would be inclined to approach a conflict in which they judged the purity of religion to be imperilled by human authority<sup>2</sup>. Nor can there be much doubt as to one cause, at all events, of the strength of purpose which was in many of the Marian exiles when they returned to bear part in the ecclesiastical history of their time. Probably nothing had produced a deeper or more effectual impression on their minds than what they had seen or heard of Geneva under Calvin's control. During

<sup>1</sup> First published in 1575; reprinted in *The Phoenix* (in 1708), vol. ii. no. xix, occupying 160 closely printed pages.

<sup>2</sup> Fuller speaks of Gilby, Whittingham, and Goodman as "certainly the *Antesignani* of the fierce Non-Conformists." The three stand together in 1558 as associated with the line taken by John Knox in *The First Blast of the Trumpet* against the Monstrous Regiment of Women, published that year at Geneva. Goodman's treatise, mentioned above, was published at the same place in the same year, and takes a similar line; and the treatise is warmly commended by Whittingham in his preface to it. In the same year and at Geneva Antony Gilby published his *Admonition to England and Scotland to call them to repentance*:—it is printed in one volume with *The*

*Appellation of John Knox* and with his remarkable announcement of his intended themes for the Second Blast of the Trumpet:—and at the outset Gilby refers with approval to Knox's First Blast and to Goodman's book, clearly though not by name. These writings were produced in hot anger at Mary's reign; they were censured by the main body of Puritan feeling, Calvin speaking sternly of Knox's book; and Goodman afterwards recanted what had given offence, Knox also trying to make his peace with Elizabeth. The tenor of the books may be shown by some passages quoted in App. I. Cf. John Knox's Works, Wodrow Society, vol. iv. pp. 351–362, 543 seq., 539, 540. Collier's *Ecclesiastical History*, vi. 272; Strype's *Annals of the Reformation*, anno 1559, ch. ix.

the time of their exile the authority of the constitution which Calvin had devised and, after many struggles, established, was unbroken, unshaken, almost unassailed; and those who visited Geneva saw a very remarkable and suggestive state of affairs. They saw dominant over a whole community a system of doctrine and discipline which was complete, coherent, and comprehensive: which ruled men, women, and children, and took heed alike of private and of public life: which committed to an ecclesiastical court or Consistory "the care of all men's manners, "power of determining all kind of ecclesiastical causes, and "authority to convent, to control, to punish, as far as with excommunication, whomsoever they should think worthy, none either "small or great excepted<sup>1</sup>": which could bring the full weight of the most awful sanction to bear alike on the least divergence in doctrine, the least point of ritual, the least disobedience in private life or in personal attire. They saw the grasp, the strength, the logic of such a system; they may have given less consideration to the vice which is said to have gone on in defiance of its exacting and intolerable rule<sup>2</sup>; and Calvin's extraordinary personality may have blinded them to the weakness of a narrow method and the sure nemesis of neglected facts. They saw how ready an answer men could under such a system give to any question that was likely to be put to them by ordinary people; how steady and compact a front was presented to the dreaded policy and strength of Rome; how secure were all the changes that Protestants had made in doctrine and in ceremonial, when they were guarded by the

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's Preface, ii. 4. In this chapter of Hooker's Preface and in the second chapter of Bancroft's Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, will be found vivid and powerful sketches of Calvin's policy at Geneva. Cf. also Espin's Critical Essays.—It should be remembered that in the Consistory there were twelve lay-members to six ministers; but there seems no reason to doubt the assertions of Hooker and Bancroft that the actual weight of power was in the hands of the ministers who formed the permanent, as against the annually elected, part of the Consistory: and that indeed "in show "a marvellous indifferently composed

"senate ecclesiastical was to govern, "but in effect one only man should, "as the spirit and soul of the residue, do all in all;"—the "citizens of "that Senate not only over-ruled by "the said six ministers; but likewise "all the ministers so over-topped by "Maister Calvin, as that in effect he "was *Domine fac totum*." Hooker, Preface, ii. 4; Bancroft, Survey, p. 25. Cf. Hooker, VII. xiv. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. T. E. Espin, Critical Essays, p. 211; T. H. Dyer, Life of Calvin, ch. vi; Hardwick, Church History: Reformation, p. 351. Also Strype's Life of Whitgift, book i. ch. 11, and Bancroft's Survey, ch. 35.

Consistorian, or, as it was constantly termed, the Holy or the Godly Discipline. It is not strange that all this, impressive even now as one reads the records of it, had an indelible effect on those who had experience of it as an actual state of things, and who returned to England with an earnest and intense desire to complete and to secure the work of change which Mary's reign had interrupted and forced back, which Elizabeth's accession seemed to make once more possible.

"That we may altogether teach and practise that true knowledge of God's Word, which we have learned in this our banishment, and by God's merciful providence seen in the best reformed churches<sup>1</sup>." Such was the longing and aim of a strong party in England as Elizabeth's reign began. Their efforts might in the first instance be directed to matters of ritual and attire; but they could not have stayed there. Their demand may seem at first to be for liberty to worship as their conscience bade them; but it would have been a sheer anachronism had they been long content that the same liberty should be allowed to others. For in the religious conflicts of the sixteenth century the goal towards which each party strove was sole ascendancy, and if toleration were asked it was only on the way to mastery<sup>2</sup>. In love, then, with the system they had seen abroad, and encouraged and counselled by the friends and teachers they had found there, a body of resolute men, strong in thoroughness, sincerity, and narrowness, rallied round them those whom the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *The Phoenix*, vol. ii. p. 182; Curteis, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 53, note (ed. 1882); Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, ii. 171-174. Also W. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 440, "Those, in particular, who had found at Zurich a secure refuge came to regard it as a sort of Jerusalem, and returned with foreign ideals in regard to worship and discipline."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hooker, VIII. iii. 4. Also *An Exhortation to the Bishops and their Clergy*, &c., B. iii, for a frank avowal of the principle that imprisonment as well as argument (though not without it) should be used in dealing with error. Also on p. 187 of the 1574 translation of

Travers' *Explicatio*, "The Magistrates ought to provide and see that the Service of God be established as He hath appointed, and administered by such as ought to administer the same, and afterwards preserved in the same simplicity and sincerity undefiled." Also, the Second Admonition to the Parliament, "The Civil Magistrate (the nurse and Foster-father of the Church) shall do well to provide some sharpe punishment for those that contemn this censure and discipline of the Church" (sc. excommunication). Cf. S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. i. pp. 23-25; Curteis, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 42, 43.

course of events in the two preceding reigns had made or prepared to be like-minded with themselves, and set to work to achieve what they judged lacking in the Reformation of the Church of England.

They found themselves confronted by the Act of Supremacy, the Act of Uniformity, and the policy of Elizabeth. Under the Act of Supremacy the Court of High Commission could be empowered "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct and amend "all such heresies, errors, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts "and enormities whatsoever which by any manner of spiritual "or ecclesiastical power, authority or jurisdiction can or may "lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained "or amended<sup>1</sup>." Under the Act of Uniformity "any manner "of parson, vicar or other whatsoever minister" who should wilfully "use any other rite, ceremony, order, form or manner" of service than that set forth in the Prayer Book of 1559, or who should "preach, declare or speak anything in the derogation or depraving of the said book" or of any part thereof, was made liable to penalties progressive in cases of repeated offence, and culminating in imprisonment for life<sup>2</sup>. Under the policy of Elizabeth, as was presently made clear, there would be no large, indifferent allowance of irregularity; whatever might be the sympathies or inclinations of the bishops, they would have to bestir themselves in the cause of order<sup>3</sup>.

Little must here be said of the first stage in the struggle thus begun; for Hooker's work does not begin till long after its close. It may conveniently be regarded as extending over the first seven or eight years of Elizabeth's reign, and as leading up to the issue of the famous Book of Advertisements, early in 1566. It was the period during which the prominent matters of conflict were matters of ritual and apparel, the sign of the Cross in Baptism, kneeling for the reception of the Holy Communion, the use of the ring in marriage, the wearing of the surplice in church and of the square cap and tippet out of church. On these and the like points the tide of Puritan feeling and determination met the constituted order of things and the authorities whose business

<sup>1</sup> Prothero, *Statutes and Constitutional Documents*, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.*, *ibid.* pp. 14, 15.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bp. Creighton, *The Church*

under Elizabeth, pp. 23, 24; W. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 434-437; S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. i. p. 26.

it was to maintain that order. If one considers the difficulties and perils out of which the Church was emerging at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the slackness and ignorance and inability of many of the parish clergy<sup>1</sup>, the inequality with which discipline was likely to be administered in different dioceses, and the zeal, ability, concentration of purpose, and sincerity of conviction which were on the side of the Puritans, it cannot seem strange that their efforts were so far successful as to give to the worship of the Church an aspect not of uniformity but of wide variety and manifold irregularity. How conspicuous the confusion and the failure of discipline had come to be is shown by a paper found among Cecil's MSS., dated February 14, 1564, and cited by Strype in his *Life of Parker* (Bk. II. ch. xix<sup>2</sup>). The paper has been often reprinted, but it may be well to cite it here; for there could hardly be a simpler or shorter delineation of the position.

*Varieties in the Services of the Church of precisians.*

*Service and Prayer.* Some say the service and prayers in the chancel; others in the body of the Church. Some say the same in a seat made in the Church; some in the Pulpit, with their faces to the people. Some keep precisely the order of the book: others intermeddle Psalms in metre. Some say with a surplice; others without a surplice.

*Table.* The Table standeth in the body of the Church in some places; in others it standeth in the chancel. In some places the Table standeth Altarlike, distant from the wall a yard. In some others in the midst of the chancel, north and south. In some places the Table is joined: in others it standeth upon Tressels. In some the Table hath a carpet, in others it hath none.

*Administration of the Communion.* Some with Surplice and Copes; some with surplice alone; others with none. Some with chalice, some with a Communion Cup; others with a Common Cup. Some with unleavened bread, some with leavened.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype's *Life of Archbishop Parker*, bk. ii. ch. 5; and Hardwick's

382, 383.

Church History: Reformation, pp. Lord Selborne, pp. 27, 147 seq.

*Receiving.* Some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting.

*Baptizing.* Some baptize in a Font, some in a Basin. Some signed with the sign of the Cross; others not signed. Some minister in a surplice, others without.

It was to mend so discreditable and dangerous a state of disorder that the Book of Advertisements was issued. Late in 1564 Cecil had submitted to Archbishop Parker a draft of a letter which he proposed to get the Queen to send to Parker, requiring that more strenuous efforts should be made to enforce order. Ten days later the letter was sent to Parker in the Queen's name, and there ensued a long correspondence, Elizabeth being characteristically reluctant to authorize publicly the unpopular action which she had privately instigated. At length, in the first week of 1566, on March 28, the Advertisements were put forth "by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's Letters<sup>1</sup>." They proved that the authorities were resolved to enforce at all events a certain degree of uniformity in the ritual of public worship and in the apparel of the clergy; a degree which, moderate as it was, went far beyond what the combatants for a "thorough" reformation were willing to observe.

But during the prolonged preparation of the Book of Advertisements and soon after its appearance, measures were taken which showed that the requirements thus promulgated were likely to be enforced. On March 3, 156 $\frac{4}{5}$ , about six weeks after Cecil had sent to Parker the draft of the letter for which he proposed to get the Queen's sanction, Parker writes, in sending to Cecil the first draft of the Advertisements: "This day in the afternoon we be agreed to have conference with Mr. Sampson, Mr. Humphrey, and four others of the ministers in London, to understand their reasons, &c., if your honour will step over to us, as it please you<sup>2</sup>." Five days later he writes again—

<sup>1</sup> There is controversy as to the reference of the words immediately following those here quoted:—the words "commanding the same." Mr. James Parker maintains that they cannot refer to the Advertisements, but must mean the due order and apparel required by the Advertisements. The whole history of the Advertisements is highly interesting and complex; but it would be im-

possible here to enter into its details. Cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 223–274; Strype's Life of Parker, bk. ii. ch. 20, bk. iii. ch. 8; and Mr. James Parker, Did Queen Elizabeth take "other order" in the "Advertisements" of 1566, a letter and a postscript.

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Sampson was the fourth Dean of Christ Church, holding office from 1561 to 1565; Lawrence Humphrey was Regius Professor of

Sampson and Humphrey hold their ground, unshaken by the conference: "They would go home again to Oxford. I told them they must tarry. If the Queen's Majesty, or you of the Council, would send for them, ye may, or if my lord of Leicester, their chancellor, will proceed. I can do no good. Better not to have begun, except more be done. All the realm is in expectation. *Sapienti pauca*. Your honour principally hath begun, *tua interest ut aliquid fiat*. If this ball shall be tossed unto us, and then have no authority by the Queen's Majesty's hand, we will set still <sup>1</sup>." After nearly two months, the matter was brought to an issue on April 29, 1565: Sampson and Humphrey were peremptorily required "to wear the cap appointed by Injunction, to wear no hats in their long gowns, to wear a surplice with a non-regent hood in their quires at their Colleges, according to the ancient manner there, to communicate kneeling in wafer-bread," or else "to depart their places." They said "their consciences could not agree to these orders"; and Sampson was thereupon deprived of his deanery, and for a while placed in confinement, but soon, on Parker's intercession, left free to go where he would <sup>2</sup>. Humphrey, "for his usefulness in the University <sup>3</sup>, had a toleration till ten or eleven years after, when he complied and wore the Habits <sup>4</sup>."

Meanwhile at Cambridge, where the refusal of conformity was wider and more vehement, the determination to enforce it was being similarly felt. George Withers, a stiff non-conformist in the matter of the square cap, had "stirred up a racket for the reformation of the University Windows": urging apparently superstition in the subjects of them: "whereupon followed a great destruction of them." The Archbishop summoned

Divinity and President of Magdalen. For a foreign estimate of Sampson cf. a letter of Bullinger's to Beza, Zurich Letters, Series II. p. 152.

<sup>1</sup> Parker Correspondence, pp. 234, 235. On March 3 he had written, "I pray you *in tota hac causa, ne nimum tendas funiculum*"; on the 24th he writes again, "I would ye had not have stirred *istam camari-nam*, or else to have set on it to some order at the beginning."

<sup>2</sup> Leonard Hutten records that he lectured for a while in London, and

ended his days as "rector" of a Hospital at Leicester. Cf. Brook's Lives of the Puritans, i. 375-384; and Wood, Athenæ Oxon. i. 550, 1. Also Zurich Letters, second series, p. 162.

<sup>3</sup> And perhaps because the Archbishop had no power to deal with him. Cf. Parker Correspondence, p. 241. The power was doubted in Sampson's case. Cf. Strype's Parker, bk. iii. ch. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Strype's Parker, *ibid.*, and Wood, Ath. Oxon. i. 558, 9.

him to London; and on March 24, 156 $\frac{4}{5}$ , writes to Cecil, "Withers is come to me *cum magna confidentia, vultu senatorio*. . . . I think that *non solum iam periculum vertitur* "in ritibus vestium tantummodo, sed omnium rituum in univ<sup>ersum</sup>, and therefore prudence would be taken." Withers' licence to preach was found to be irregular, and he "refused to enter Bonds for wearing of the Cornered Cap." He was suspended from preaching; but, on further thought, and the wiser persuasion of his flock<sup>1</sup>, "rather to wear a Cap than to forsake them," determined to submit to the requirement.—It seems to have been at a late stage in the preparation of the Advertisements that an appeal against their rumoured purport came from Cambridge to its Chancellor. The document, bearing date November 26, apparently in 1565, is given as No. 39 in the Appendix to Strype's Life of Parker. It is temperate and submissive in tone, and it bears the signatures of men prominent and weighty in the University, Whitgift's being one; but Strype records that it was ill taken, that a great stir was made about it, and that the Chancellor wrote a very sharp letter in reply—a letter which certainly brought a very submissive apology from Robert Beaumont, Master of Trinity, the first of the signatories to the original appeal<sup>2</sup>. But it was reserved for the members of St. John's to provoke and receive the sharpest censure. A young man named Fulke, belonging to that society<sup>3</sup>, had "lefte of wearinge a square cappe and used a hatte," and had both in St. Mary's and in the College Chapel preached violently against the use of the surplice. He seems to have stirred the College greatly, and "in fine they waxed so hot that they could abide no such garment upon them"; and one festival-day, the Master, Longworth, being absent (not, it is hinted, without knowledge of what was to happen), "the most part of the College-Company," some three hundred in number, appeared in Chapel without their surplices. Cecil, as Chancellor, was greatly moved; he con-

<sup>1</sup> At Bury. The sequence of events is not quite clear, but cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 234, 236, 238; Strype's Life of Parker, bk. iii. ch. i, 3; Mullinger, History of the University of Cambridge, ii. 196, 197.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Mullinger, History of the University of Cambridge, pp. 198,

199; Strype's Life of Parker, bk. iii ch. 3, App. No. xxxix; Annals, vol. i. ch. 44.

<sup>3</sup> Afterwards Master of Pembroke, Margaret Professor of Divinity, and prominent in controversy against Rome. Cf. Brook's Puritans, i. 385-392.

sulted the Archbishop, reported the matter to the Queen, stirred up the Visitor, and wrote a letter to the Vice-Chancellor about "these fanatical devises," "this apostasy," "this lewd leprosy of "Libertines"; and he summoned Fulke and Longworth up to London to be dealt with. How Fulke fared does not appear; but Longworth had to sign and to read before the whole company of the College on his return a confession of his misdoing, and a promise to observe and to enforce order for the future<sup>1</sup>.

While the resolute attitude of the authorities was thus becoming clear to the "precisians" of Oxford and of Cambridge, it was being felt not less certainly in London. That Grindal, Bishop of London, was reluctant to take strong measures for enforcing uniformity, appears in many passages of Parker's letters to Cecil<sup>2</sup>; but the prevalence of disorder, and the Queen's anger at it, seem towards the close of 1565 to have conquered his reluctance, and on March 20 he joined with Parker in writing to Cecil of a great effort which they were preparing to make. They proposed to summon to Lambeth "all manner of pastors and curates "within the city of London"; to ask them whether they would "promise conformity in their ministrations and outward apparel, "stablished by law and injunction"; to suspend those who refused such promise, and if three months later they still persisted in their refusal, to deprive them of their livings. On March 26, two days before the issue of the Advertisements, this course was taken. Parker was plainly anxious about it; for on the previous day he wrote to Cecil, begging that he, the Lord Keeper, and the Marquess of Northampton would be present at Lambeth; and immediately after the business he writes to tell Cecil how it had gone. "Sixty-one promised conformity, nine or ten were absent; "thirty-seven denied, of which number were the best, and some "preachers; six or seven convenient sober men, pretending a conscience, divers of them but zealous, and of little learning and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype, *Life of Parker*, bk. iii. ch. 3, and App. Nos. xli, xlii; *Annals*, vol. i. ch. 44; Mullinger, *History of the University of Cambridge*, ii. 199, 205, 206; J. Parker's Letter to Lord Selborne, p. 75; Thomas Baker, *History of St. John's College*, ed. J. E. B. Mayor, pp. 162, 163. A

delightful letter, showing how these quarrels and troubles looked to a scholar who was watching them, is printed as No. xliii in the Appendix to Strype's *Life of Parker*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 235, 237, 270, 279, 284.

"judgement<sup>1</sup>." Some of those who had refused came afterwards to another mind, but several letters of the Archbishop's show the difficulty of providing for the deserted parishes, and the violence and profanity with which in some cases those who would have filled the vacant places were encountered<sup>2</sup>. Far and wide, in England and abroad, the promulgation of the Advertisements and the measures taken at or near the same time to repress disorder and compel obedience were felt as marking the passage of affairs into a new phase<sup>3</sup>.

Nor was it long before this stronger action on the side of uniformity was met by a corresponding advance on the side of innovation<sup>4</sup>. A new spirit was evinced, destined to play a great part in future conflicts. New leaders came to the front; new matters of contention, weightier than those which had hitherto been most agitated, were brought into steady prominence<sup>5</sup>; a new plan of campaign was gradually developed and adopted<sup>6</sup>; and a new term began to be on men's lips as they talked of those who were denouncing the corruption of the Church, and extolling the purity and beauty of the Holy Discipline. Henceforward there is no anachronism in speaking of the *Puritans*.

The stage into which the movement thus entered was that in which Hooker had to deal with it, and it therefore seems appropriate to mark with some detail the events and characteristics which now came to modify its aspect. They belong to the six years following the issue of the Advertisements; they may be regarded as concurrent lines in one great course of change which told with deep effect on the developement of Puritanism and on the attitude of those who, by argument or constraint or both, tried to repress it.

In the first place there occurred at this crisis the earliest

<sup>1</sup> Parker Correspondence, 269, 270.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Parker Correspondence, 267-281; Strype's Life of Grindal, bk. i. ch. 10, 11.

<sup>3</sup> An effort had been made to call in all licences to preach, but apparently with incomplete effect. Cf. however Strype's Parker, bk. iii. ch. 2; Neal, i. 193; Punchard, ii. 449; Zurich Letters, second series, p. 162.

<sup>4</sup> For the way in which the Puritans looked back to this date cf.

the Preface to the Admonition. "By experience their rigour hath too plainly appeared ever since their wicked reign, and specially for the space of these five or six years last past together": i.e. the five or six years preceding 1572.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Hooker, Preface, ch. 2, § 10, and note in vol. i. p. 142 (ed. 1888).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Hooker, bk. v. App. ii. § 2 (p. 599). For a foreign view cf. letters printed with the Admonition.

deliberate and organized separation of Puritans from the Church of England<sup>1</sup>—several of the deprived ministers resolving that, “since they could not have the Word of God preached, nor the Sacraments administered without idolatrous gear . . . it was their duty . . . to break off from the publick Churches, and to assemble, as they had opportunity, in private houses, or elsewhere, to worship God in a manner that might not offend against the light of their consciences<sup>2</sup>.” Thus, therefore, when it became certain that the measure of uniformity shown in the Advertisements would really be required, a division came in the ranks of those who set themselves against it. Strype’s account of the distinction is held by Dr. Punchard<sup>3</sup> to be “in the main true”—

“The Refusers of the Orders of the Church (who by this time were commonly called *Puritans*) were grown now into two Factions. The one was of a more quiet and peaceable demeanour; who indeed would not use the habits, nor subscribe to the ceremonies enjoined; as Kneeling at the Sacrament, the Cross in Baptism, the Ring in Marriage; but held to the Communion of the Church, and willingly and devoutly joined with the Common Prayers. But another sort there was, that disliked the whole constitution of the Church lately Reformed; charging upon it many gross remainders of Popery, and that it was full of corruptions not to be borne with, and antichristian; and especially the habits which the Clergy were enjoined to use in their conversation and ministration. Insomuch that these latter separated themselves into private assemblies, meeting together not in churches, but in private houses where they had ministers of their own<sup>4</sup>.”

Elsewhere Strype cites, apparently verbatim, the ground of their separation: “because the Ceremonies of Antichrist were tied to the Service of God; so that no man might Preach and Administer the Sacraments without them. And that it was compelling these things by Law that made them separate<sup>5</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype’s *Life of Parker*, bk. iii. ch. 16; *Life of Grindal*, bk. i. ch. 12; *Zurich Letters*, 1st series, pp. 201, 221, 237, 249; 2nd series, 155; *Brook’s Lives of the Puritans*, vol. i. pp. 28, 29; *Neal’s History of the Puritans*, vol. i. pp. 204–206.

<sup>2</sup> Neal, i. 204.

<sup>3</sup> *History of Congregationalism*, ii. 455. Cf. a very interesting note in the Appendix to vol. iii. Note F. Dr. Punchard makes a curious mistake in regard to the date of G. Cranmer’s letter to Hooker.

<sup>4</sup> *Life of Grindal*, i. 12.

<sup>5</sup> *Life of Parker*, iii. 16.

They used in their meetings the Prayer Book which, with Calvin's approval, had been used by the English community at Geneva, and of which the greater part is reprinted in the *Phoenix*<sup>1</sup>. The separation was strongly disliked by the more prudent and learned among the English Puritans, and was in contravention of counsel which had been received from some of their chief authorities abroad: while among the bishops even those who were, as Grindal, least inclined to severity in the cause of order speak severely on this point. A passage in one of Grindal's letters to Bullinger is suggestive. He writes in the June of 1568—

"Our controversy concerning the habits, about which you write, had "cooled down for a time<sup>2</sup>, but broke out again last winter; and this "by the means of some who are more zealous than they are either "learned or gifted with pious discretion. Some London citizens of "the lowest order, together with four or five ministers, remarkable "neither for their judgement nor learning, have openly separated from "us; and sometimes in private houses, sometimes in the fields, and "occasionally even in ships, they have held their meetings and administered the Sacraments. Besides this, they have ordained ministers, "elders, and deacons, after their own way, and have even excommunicated some who had seceded from their Church. And because "masters Lawrence Humphrey, Sampson, Lever, and others, who have "suffered so much to obtain liberty in respect of things indifferent, will "not unite with them, they now regard them as semi-papists, and will "not allow their followers to attend their preaching<sup>3</sup>."

The principle of toleration and the policy of letting things alone were alien to the age; and even had they been congenial to it, Elizabeth would probably have rejected them. And thus it is not surprising that royal letters urged the commissioners to strenuous action against those who had so set their judgement against the Queen's; that, when a number of them had been caught in their "clancular and separate" worship, they were brought to account; that they on their part made their plight worse by strong talk under examination; that several of them were imprisoned; and that the separation went on unhealed, till

<sup>1</sup> Vol. ii. pp. 204 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly during the interval of which Neal speaks, in which the non-conformists were waiting to see

whether the Queen would relent.

<sup>3</sup> Zurich Letters, Series I. pp. 201, 202.

it hardened beyond hope of healing<sup>1</sup>. Henceforward the Puritan party was to include some who were engaged in building up their own organization, practising their own worship, exercising their own discipline, in severance and distinctness from that historic body which had carried through the Reformation the constitution and the tradition of primitive times. It is hard in the present day to realize the difference that this change made in the subsequent tenor of conflict and controversy during Elizabeth's reign.

It is next to be remarked that, in the same period with this great change in the aspect of Puritanism, younger leaders came to head the movement<sup>2</sup>, and graver topics characterized the controversy. Among the leaders one stands out conspicuously, and it was about this time that he began to take the lead. Thomas Cartwright became Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in the year in which Hooker, as a lad of about sixteen, went up to Oxford. But he outlived Hooker by three years. His was the highest authority among English Puritans during Hooker's manhood<sup>3</sup>, and there is no opponent to whose writings Hooker refers nearly so often as to those of "T. C." It may be well therefore to try to form some idea of the qualities and character with which Cartwright advanced to the front of the fight<sup>4</sup>.

He was a man who would have been prominent in any age.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Neal, i. 215-219.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bp. Cooper, quoted in Mr. Keble's Hooker, vol. i. p. 142, note 1; and Bancroft's Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, pp. 55, 56.

<sup>3</sup> Walter Travers, of whom more will presently be said, is often joined with him; but it seems clear that Cartwright was the stronger and the greater man.

<sup>4</sup> It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of Cartwright's work and influence. At every stage in the definition and declaration of the Puritan position he comes forward: laying down his theses in 1570, bearing part in and defending the Admonitions in 1572, writing the preface for and translating Travers' *Explicatio* in 1574, and closely associated with the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra* in the next decade. He, more

nearly than any other, seems to hold Calvin's place among English Protestants; and, like Calvin, he had wide influence abroad, aiding the Puritans of Jersey and Guernsey in settling their discipline. C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, p. 42; Brook's Cartwright, p. 218. There is a MS. in the British Museum (Harl. 3998. pp. 203 seq.) entitled *The Ecclesiastical Discipline*, as it hath been practised since the Reformation of the Church by the Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of the Churches of Guernsey, Jersey, Sarck and Orkeny (*sic*). It was established in 1576, reviewed and confirmed in 1597. The Church officers are to be Ministers, Doctors, Elders, and Deacons.—In the main the lines are those of the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra* (v. App. iii).

Beza thought him the most learned man he knew; Fuller records his fame as that of "a pure Latinist, accurate Grecian, exact "Hebraicist"; Andrew Melville tried hard to get him to Glasgow; Sir Francis Walsingham set him to deal with the Rheims New Testament. The stories told of the enthusiasm stirred by his preaching at Cambridge, both in his earlier days and in his old age, seem unparalleled in the annals of University Sermons. His eminence as a theologian is sufficiently brought out by the fact that in 1569 he was elected Lady Margaret Professor, when he was barely thirty-five years old. His skill in handling a difficulty will strike any one who will read his letter to Cecil of July the 9th, 1570<sup>1</sup>. His repute and energy as a controversialist are plain in his struggle with Whitgift: in his "Reply to the Answer to "the Admonition," in his "Second Replie against Master Doctor "Whitgift's Second Answer," in "The Rest of the Second Replie of Thomas Cartwright<sup>2</sup>." There can hardly be any doubt as to his erudition, ability, sincerity, or courage. And yet an historian who cannot be charged with any prejudice against Nonconformists has written of him thus:—"No leader of a religious party ever "deserved less of after sympathy than Cartwright. He was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor. . . . With the despotism of a Hildebrand, Cartwright combined the cruelty of a Torquemada<sup>3</sup>."

The present writer ventures to think that this verdict is unduly stern: but it does seem clear that with a very definite conception of the end Cartwright combined a lack of carefulness about the means; that all his learning had not made him large-hearted; that in his admiration for the strength and completeness of the Genevan system he would not have recoiled from its narrow harshness. It seems, for instance, an indefensible use of a great trust that as soon as he was appointed Lady Margaret Professor he set himself to advocate "the Puritan plan for reforming the "government" of the Church<sup>4</sup>; and that, moreover, at a time when, as he must have well known, the work and discipline of several of the foreign Universities had been thrown into

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype's *Annals*, vol. ii. App. i.

<sup>2</sup> These works, published in 1572, 1575, and 1577 respectively, are those referred to by Hooker as T. C. i., T. C. ii., and T. C. iii.

<sup>3</sup> J. R. Green, *History of the English People*, pp. 455, 456.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, p. 41.

disorder by controversy on such matters, and when there certainly were ardent spirits ready enough for turbulence at Cambridge<sup>1</sup>. It is difficult to avoid judging that in this the zeal of the Puritan overbore the loyalty of the Professor; and that there was something to be said for the course of those who refused him the degree of Doctor, suspended him from lecturing, and deprived him of his office in the University<sup>2</sup>. Again, if nothing be said about the First Admonition to the Parliament, which Cartwright defended, there are in the Second Admonition (which he wrote) many passages of such ribald violence as is disgraceful in an educated man who was treating of grave subjects at a time when examples of temperance and charity were greatly needed. Cartwright was nearly forty: he had received the best culture that England could give: he sets on the title-page of his book words which amount to a claim to have been sent by God to prophesy in His Name: and he can stoop to write of the ministry of the Church as "bastard," "idol": of the Universities as "dennes of many theevish non-residentes"; and of livings bestowed "to the greedy use of many cormorant masters of Colledges and "at theyr wicked pleasure"; that "boyes and senseless asses are "our common minysters for the moste parte"; that the bishops "are none other but a remnant of Antichristes broode"; that they are "starke naught," not only for their bribing and corruption, "and their arrogancie, their tyrannie, but for flat heresie in "the sacrament":—and lastly he can write in regard to the care for the poor "I beseeche the whole state, and beseeche God that "the whole state may bend themselves to have more and more "care for the godly straungers that are of the churches in deede": . . . "For the other swine that are not of the churches, I pray "God they may fynde little favoure except they repent and "joyne themselves to the churches<sup>3</sup>." It may with truth be pleaded in excuse for Cartwright that he was provoked by great abuses, by wide and unrebuked neglect of duty; that controversy in his day used such licence as would now be thought intolerable;

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Marsden, *History of the Early Puritans*, pp. 75, 76; Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, vol. ii. pp. 203-214.

<sup>2</sup> In the following year (1571) his fellowship at Trinity was also taken

from him, on the ground that he was not in Priest's Orders. It was after this that he withdrew to Geneva.

<sup>3</sup> A Second Admonition to the Parliament, pp. 12, 13, 20, 35, 43, 52.

that he does not come near the brutality and buffoonery of Martin Mar-Prelate. All this is true, but it is not adequate; it does not account for the vast difference between Cartwright's tone and Hooker's; it does not extenuate the narrow and hard-hearted bitterness of the passage last quoted<sup>1</sup>. Still less can any such excuses palliate the determined and tremendous harshness of the words he wrote in a later stage of the same debate:—

"The same severity of punishment that was used against false prophets then [scil. under the Mosaic Law] ought to be used now under the gospel against false teachers comparing one person and circumstance with another. As he that hath fallen away from God and gone about to draw others away: to be handled according to the law prescribed in that Ch. 13 of Deuteronomy<sup>2</sup>. If this be bloody and extreme I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost<sup>3</sup>."

And again:

"In this case of willing sliding back and moving others to the same, and other some cases which are expressed in the law, as of open and horrid blasphemy of the Name of God, I deny that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death, which the Judicial law doth require<sup>4</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting and just to mark that some among the Puritans seem to have shown disapproval of Cartwright's tone in controversy, for in 1574 he himself says, "Cum quosdam nostros offensiores acceperim, qui mihi ad hominem importunissimum modeste respondent, et asperrimis confodientem leviter repungenti, succenserunt; sane ut eorum in me offensione doleo, sic illis gratulor," &c. Eccl. Disc. Explic., Præfatio ad Lectorem. Hooker's words on the subject are famous and characteristic: "Concerning the Defender of" the Admonitions, all that I mean to say is but this: *there will come a time when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit.*" Preface, ii. 10.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Deut. xiii. 6, 8, 9, 10: "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend,

which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; . . . thou shalt not consent unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him; neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die."

<sup>3</sup> Cartwright, Second Reply, &c., p. cxv. Cf. Reply, pp. 35, 36. Similarly John Knox in his Appellation refers to the Book of Deuteronomy, and writes, "Of these words of Moses are two things appertaining to one purpose, to be noted. Former, that such as solicitate only to idolatry ought to be punished to death without favour or respect of person," pp. 28, 29: ed. 1558.

<sup>4</sup> Id., *ibid.* p. cxvi. In the "Table" at the end of the volume appear these headings—"Contemners of the Word

These are words of "the leader of the English Elizabethan 'Puritanism'<sup>1</sup>"; and it is right to bear such words in mind. For they warrant those who are studying the conflict of that period in looking to Geneva under Calvin's rule as a picture of what England might, for a while at least, have been, if the Puritans had freely had their way. Here are the premisses of that tyranny, and the narrow logic which would use them in the same way: here is the same confident sternness, the same un pitying estimate of religious duty, the same perilous concentration of attention, the same hardness of will. The story of Servetus' trial and death comes back to one; and it is hard to think that Cartwright's course in the matter would have been very different from Calvin's. It is said that through all the successive editions of the Institutes Calvin never changed a point of principle from that which he had promulgated first when he was but twenty-six, save only to withdraw what he had written in praise of toleration<sup>2</sup>; and the same temper of reckless and relentless certainty passed into some of his English disciples. The praise of having fought for religious liberty has sometimes been oddly asked and given; but it is hard to discover any sense in which it can be rightly claimed for Thomas Cartwright. Rather one may feel surè that had he won his way and fastened upon England the system he extolled, many here would have professed their judgements, as did some of the chiefest place among the laity of Geneva beneath Calvin's hand, "that such a discipline was little "better than Popish tyranny disguised and tendered unto them "under a new form<sup>3</sup>."

It was said above that with the advance of younger leaders, such as Cartwright, to the front of the Puritan movement,

"ought to be put to death." "The punishing of the breaches of the "Second Table by death, and not of "the first, is to begin at the wrong end."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, p. 31; Bancroft, *Survey*, p. 55; Hallam, i. 251.

<sup>2</sup> T. E. Espin, *Critical Essays*, p. 181. On the death of Servetus, cf. id., *ibid.* pp. 219-228.

<sup>3</sup> Hooker, *Preface*, ch. 2, § 4. Cf. Hallam, *Constitutional History*, i. 186-188. A groundless fragment of academic gossip said that Cart-

wright's bitterness against authority began when Elizabeth, during a visit to Cambridge, preferred to him, in a set disputation, Thomas Preston. The story deserves no belief at all, for in the disputation Cartwright was not Preston's antagonist in any way; they fought on the same side, and Preston was so far more prominent a member of the University than Cartwright that they can hardly have been rivals. Cf. Nichols's *Progresses*, i. 168-189; Brook's *Memoir of Thomas Cartwright*, pp. 41-43.

a change may also be marked in the topics that are foremost in the struggle. This change appears somewhat strikingly in the propositions advanced by Cartwright as Margaret Professor of Divinity in 1570. The distinctive prominence of apparel as the chief matter of previous contention has been shown in the brief account here given of the troubles about the time of the promulgation of the Advertisements<sup>1</sup>. But Cartwright fights on another field. He is charged, in the indictment of him sent by Dr. Chaderton to Cecil as Chancellor of the University, with having taught "that in the Church of England there was no "lawful and ordinary calling and choosing or admitting of "Ministers, and that the election of Ministers and Bishops "at this day was tyrannous; and that Archbishops, Deans, "Archdeacons, &c., were offices and names of impiety"; and it is similarly urged by Grindal that he "did daily make "invectives against the extern policy and distinction of States "in the Ecclesiastical Government<sup>2</sup>." Cartwright's vindication of himself in a letter to Cecil shows plainly the change that has passed over the character of the agitation. He earnestly professes "oblatam etiam de *Vestibus* occasionem prætereundo "dissimulasse"; and so too some of his friends declare him "de *Vestibus* controversiam ne attigisse quidem<sup>3</sup>." That topic has fallen from its prominent and chief emphasis. But in the same letter Cartwright frankly adds: "Non nego quin docuerim "*Ministerium* nostrum ab avitæ et Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ "Ministerio deflexisse: cujus ad Puritatem nostram exigi et "efformari cupiebam"; and the six propositions which are said

<sup>1</sup> Thus, "the Outward Apparel and "ministering Garments of the Popish "Church" seems the theme of a book described at length by Strype (Annals, vol. i. pt. i. ch. 44) as "sent abroad "by their common consent in vindication of themselves," in 1566: It bears as its second title, A Declaration of the Doings of those Ministers of God's Word and Sacraments in the City of London which have refused to wear the outward Apparel and Ministering garments of the Pope's Church.—Considerably more ground is covered by a paper which Strype gives at full length (Annals, I.

i. 17), referring it conjecturally to the year 1560; but it can hardly be regarded as a Puritan manifesto, and "it does not seem to have attracted "much attention." (Punchard, History of Congregationalism, ii. 486.)

<sup>2</sup> Strype (Annals, I. i. 57), where the advance is expressly marked. Cf. also Bp. Cooper's Admonition to the People of England (p. 160), quoted in Keble's ed. of Hooker, i. 142, note 1, and Bp. Bancroft's Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, pp. 54-56.

<sup>3</sup> Strype, Annals, vol. ii. p. 2 and Appendix.

to have been "set down and subscribed by his own hand," and which were sent from Cambridge to the Chancellor, have nothing to do with ritual or apparel, but are concerned with the constitution and ministry of the Church. To these six propositions Strype adds twenty more which were, he says, "propounded and "divulged abroad by the said Cartwright and others in the "University"; and the whole series make a considerable advance towards completing the main lines of the Puritan position. But it will be better to trace these lines in an ampler and more public presentation of them, by considering somewhat fully the Admonitions to the Parliament with which Cartwright's pre-eminence in the controversy of his day is especially connected; and for the full appreciation of the part borne by these famous "Admonitions" in the long struggle it is necessary to review briefly the public events which led up to them.

Elizabeth's Third Parliament sat from April 2 to May 29, 1571. The records of its proceedings are imperfect and confused<sup>1</sup>; but, out of the frequent notices which deal with its agitation over ecclesiastical matters, thus much clearly comes to light. There was in the House of Commons a resolute and active party in sympathy with the general tendency of the Puritans. As spokesman of this party Mr. Strickland, supported by Mr. Norton, moved on April 6 for a conference between a Committee of the Commons and a Committee of the Lords as to further reformation in matters of religion, endeavouring also to bring before the House the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, of which a new edition, prepared and published in the hope that it might find favour in Parliament, was produced on this occasion by Mr. Norton<sup>2</sup>. A Committee was appointed, and increased on April 10, when a Committee of the Lords also was appointed for the conference. On the 14th (Easter Eve) "the Bill "for Reformation of the Book of Common Prayer was read the "first time," "being preferred by Mr. Strickland," and it was decided that the Queen should be asked "for her licence and privity to proceed in this Bill<sup>3</sup>." But during the adjournment of the House for Easter Mr. Strickland was summoned before

<sup>1</sup> Cf. D'Ewes' Journal, p. 158 and *passim*; also *passim*, the Journals of both Houses. An attempt is made in App. ii to unravel the complexity

of the records.

<sup>2</sup> Id., *ibid.* 156, 157; *Reformatio*, &c., ed. Cardwell, pp. xi, xii, xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> D'Ewes, pp. 166, 167.

the Privy Council, and required to absent himself from the House during the Queen's pleasure<sup>1</sup>. On April 20, the second day after Parliament re-assembled, a debate took place on this invasion of the liberties of the House; the debate was after a while checked by the Speaker, and on the following day Mr. Strickland reappeared in his place. But nothing further seems to have been heard in Parliament of his Bill, or of the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*<sup>2</sup>; and on May 1 the Queen's mind as to legislation in such matters was plainly expressed by a message having reference to the Bill in confirmation of the Articles of 1562: "The Queen's Majesty . . . mindeth to publish them, and have them executed by the Bishops, by direction of her Highness' Regal Authority of Supremacy of the Church of England, and not to have the same dealt in by Parliament<sup>3</sup>." Notwithstanding this message the Commons only two days later, on May 3, sent up to the Lords "The Bill for the Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion," elsewhere called "The Bill for the Order of Ministers," and formally entitled "An Act to reform Certain Disorders touching the Ministers of the Church<sup>4</sup>." This is the very important Act, 13 Eliz. cap. xii, which in the Journals of the House of Lords stands first among the Acts passed in this Parliament,—the Act under which subscription to the Articles was required. The difficult questions as to the precise meaning of this Act cannot here be considered; they are discussed by Archdeacon Hardwick in his *History of the Articles*, pp. 226 seq., and by Cardwell, *Synodalia*, i. 53, note, and *Documentary Annals*, i. 411. But, together with the treatment Mr. Strickland's Bill had received, and the Queen's message on May 1, the Act must have shown clearly that a policy of strictness would be maintained, and the Puritans must have looked back over the session of 1571 with disappointment and uneasiness<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> D'Ewes, pp. 168, 175.

<sup>2</sup> It is, however, said to have been ordered to be translated into English. Cf. Cardwell's ed., p. xii and note.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. a like message on May 22, 1572: "Her Highness' pleasure is, that from henceforth no Bills concerning Religion shall be preferred or received into this House, unless

"the same should be first considered and liked by the Clergy." D'Ewes, p. 213. Cf. also id. pp. 236 seq., 260, for the incident of Peter Wentworth's speech and its sequel in 1576.

<sup>4</sup> D'Ewes, pp. 145, 181. Cf. Strype's *Annals*, vol. ii. p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> For a fuller account of these Bills cf. Appendix ii. The Canons for

It seems probable, however, that the action of the Court of High Commission immediately after that session told more directly on the course of events. Directions issued in June, 1571, had ordered Churchwardens and other like officers to allow no one to preach who had not a licence dated "after the 1st of May last," and a letter from the Queen to the Archbishop on August 20 shows the pressure that was urging strenuous action<sup>1</sup>. The lines that action took are clear.

The Second Part of the First Admonition is arranged under three Articles, to which, it appears, subscription was required by the High Commissioners<sup>2</sup>. What these Articles were may be learnt not only from the Admonition, where they are given at full length, but also from the case of Robert Johnson, who was required to sign them as a condition of receiving a licence to officiate<sup>3</sup>. They ran thus:

"First, that the book commonly called the Book of Common Prayer for the Church of England, authorized by Parliament, and all and every the contents therein be such as are not repugnant to the Word of God." Second, "That the manner and order appointed by public authority about the administration of the Sacraments and Common Prayers, and that the Apparell by sufficient Authority appointed for the Ministers within the Church of England, be not wicked nor against the Word of God, but tolerable, and, being commanded for order and obedience sake, are to be used." Third, "That the Articles of Religion which only concern the true Christian Faith, and the doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted 'Articles, whereupon it was agreed by both Archbishops, &c.' and every of them contain true and godly Christian doctrine."

It will be seen at once that the first and second of these Articles bear directly on the main points in controversy between

Discipline, drawn up in Convocation this year, and laid before the Queen but never sanctioned by her, show how seriously and resolutely the authorities were setting about the task of securing regularity in all orders of the Church, beginning with the bishops. Cf. Cardwell's *Synodalia*, i. 111 seq.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Parker Correspondence, pp. 382, 386. Cf. also Strype's Parker, bk. iv. ch. 5; Neal, i. 240, 241.

<sup>2</sup> These Articles must be distinguished not only from the Articles of 1562, but also from the three Articles put forward by Whitgift in 1584 and introduced into the Canons of 1603. Cf. Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, 231, 233; Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, i. 229; also Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, i. 411 note, 413.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Strype, *Life of Parker*, bk. iv. ch. 6.

the ecclesiastical authorities and the Puritans ; and it is said that by the action of the High Commissioners at this time about one hundred ministers suffered deprivation<sup>1</sup>. It is not strange that the events of 1571 hastened on that developement of the Puritan position which had been advancing ever since the issue of the Advertisements in 1566, and which now found its full public utterance in the Admonitions to the Parliament.

The First Admonition was published anonymously in 1572<sup>2</sup>, and it is said that it was "so eagerly read that it went through "four editions before the end of 1572"<sup>3</sup>. There are in Oxford two interesting copies of a composite volume containing (1) The First Admonition, in two parts or treatises, followed by (a) an Explanation of the reasons for which the treatises are sent out anonymously and with no printer's name, and (b) two letters written in 1566, one from Rodolphe Gualter to J. P., the most vigilant B. of N., the other from Beza to E. G., Bishop of L.; (2) A distinct work, comprising, with a Preface<sup>4</sup>, (a) "An Exhortation to the Bishops to deal Brotherly with their Brethren," and (b) "An Exhortation to the Bishops and their Clergie to Aunswer a little booke that came forth the last Parliament;" (3) A Second Admonition to the Parliament, with a Preface; (4) "Certaine Articles, collected and taken (as it is thought) by the Byshops out of a little boke entituled an "Admonition to the Parliament, wyth an Answere to the same":

"Imprinted we know where, and whan,  
"Judge you the place and you can."

One of these volumes is in the Bodleian Library, the other in the Christ Church Library ; and in both is written, by the hand of "Jo. Feilde" (who was imprisoned in 1572 either for having

<sup>1</sup> Archdeacon Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 230, note. Cf. *Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. bk. i. ch. 20. Neal, i. 251. (But the statement requires scrutiny.) To some date in the period here described may be assigned the curious paper cited in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Addenda 1566-1573*, pp. li. seq. It contains a proposal for transplanting the precisians, to the number of 3,000 men, to Ireland, and

giving them a portion of Ulster, "there, as concerning religion, to live "according to the reformation of the "best Churches."

<sup>2</sup> The date is given at the end of the Preface to the two letters which are appended to the Admonition.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Strype, Life of Parker*, IV. ix. p. 347; *Keble's Hooker*, i. 141.

<sup>4</sup> Bearing date, "From my Chamber in London, this 30 of September, in anno 1572."

presented to the Parliament a copy of the First Admonition, or for having, with Wilcox, written it), the self-same poem, addressed to two different ladies<sup>1</sup>. On the last page of this volume mention is made of "the bloude of our brethren in Fraunce, whych is yet greene before our eyes, and yet lyeth upon the face of the streates and fieldes of that curssed land"; and this reference to the massacre of St. Bartholomew<sup>2</sup>, as an event still recent, together with the uniformity of the volume<sup>3</sup>, and with Field's apparent distribution of it, seems to show that it may be regarded as a deliberately formed collection of Puritan declarations made at that stage in the developement of their scheme for the Reformation of the Church of England. It is said that Cartwright was supposed to have instigated the publication of the First Admonition; the present writer has never seen any denial of the generally accepted statement that it was Cartwright who wrote the second<sup>4</sup>; and the defence of all four treatises<sup>5</sup> against Whitgift's censures was his great and voluminous share in the controversy of the next five years.

The general character of the volume is that of a manifesto, or

<sup>1</sup> It has been debated whether the Admonition was ever actually presented to the Parliament. Neal says it was (vol. i. p. 253). Strype's statements are contradictory; in the *Annals* (bk. i. ch. 20) he says that Field and Wilcox were imprisoned "for offering this seditious book to the Parliament"; in the *Life of Parker* (bk. iv. ch. 12) and in the *Life of Whitgift* (bk. i. ch. 6) he says it was never offered. This latter statement seems the more deliberately made, and it is confirmed by the general character of the Admonition, which is far removed from the semblance of an address to be formally presented, and by the fact that in the letter addressed to Burghley from Newgate by Field and Wilcox there is no allusion to any other charge than that of having written the book (*Strype's Annals*, vol. ii. App. p. 38); and still more by the fact that when Whitgift in his *Defence* had said (p. 13, ed. 1574): "They did not only propound it out of time (after the Parliament was ended), but out of order also, that

"is in the manner of a libell," Cartwright in his *Second Replie* (p. xv. ed. 1575) leaves the allegation unanswered. The expressions in the Second Admonition which bear on the question (A. ii, iii) are compatible with the view that the book was written in the form of an Appeal to the Parliament, and with the brevity required for presentation, but that it was never presented. The records of Parliament seem too scanty for their silence to be conclusive, but the balance of evidence seems strongly against its ever having been presented.

<sup>2</sup> August 24, 1572.

<sup>3</sup> It is further held together by the one list of Errata on the last page.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Brook, *Memoir of Thomas Cartwright*, p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. T. C. i. pp. 175, 176, 177. It may be noticed that on pp. 189 and 301 of the 1573 edition of Whitgift's *Answer* it appears that the edition of the Admonition here used was not the first edition.

series of such utterances, put forth at a time of great excitement. It is deficient in arrangement and system; it is devoted more largely to statement than to argument; it attacks the existing state of things bitterly and incisively; it flies at abuses, as though to stir to the utmost vehemence the agitation for reform<sup>1</sup>. If thus it deals savagely with the Bishops, it also does less than justice to the Puritans, whose position, system, and policy may be better learnt from the more deliberate and sober writings which will be presently noticed. But as a downright declaration of that which the Puritans now had in view it is interesting and important, while its prominence in the controversy, its association with famous names, and its substantial harmony with the more careful treatises which followed it, emphasize its claim to attention.

The extent of the changes demanded is fairly shown on p. 2 of the Preface to the First Admonition—

“Either must we have a right ministerye of God, and a right government of His Church, according to the Scriptures set up (bothe which we lacke), or else there can be no right religion, nor yet for contempt thereof can Goddes plagues be from us any while deferred.”

And so again on p. 1 of the Admonition—

“It hath ben thought good to proferre to your godly consyderations a true platforme of a Church reformed, to the end that it being laide before your eyes, to beholde the great unlikenes betwixt it and this our English Church: you may learne either with perfect hatred to detest the one, and with singuler love to embrace, and carefull endeavor to plant the other: or els to be without excuse before the majestie of our God, who (for the discharge of our conscience, and manifestation of his truth) hath by us revealed unto you at this present, the sinceritie and simplicitie of his Gospell.”

It is added that

“we in England are so far off, from having a Church rightly reformed, according to the prescripte of God’s Woorde, that as yet we are scarce come to the outward face of the same.”

Such then is the scope of the reform to which the writers of the Admonition exhort the Parliament; and they go on to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hooker, Preface, iii. 6, 7; Book I. i. 1.

set forth in more detail the several changes by which it is to be achieved, and the blemishes or abuses which prove that it is necessary. The outward marks of a true Christian Church are first defined to be (1) preaching of the word purely, (2) ministering of the sacraments sincerely, and (3) ecclesiastical discipline, which consists in admonition and correction of faults severely. The Church of England is then tried in regard to these three marks. As to the first, it is admitted that the substance of doctrine by many delivered is sound and good: "yet here in it faileth, "that neyther the ministers therof are according to God's word "proved, elected, called, or ordained: nor the function in such "sort so narrowly looked unto, as of right it oughte, and is of "necessytie required." There ought to be *a trial*, both as to ability and as to character—and those who were priests under Henry VIII and Mary ought to be utterly removed. There ought to be an *election* of the minister by the Elders with the common consent of the whole Church. The minister should be *called* by the congregation: not thrust on them by the Bishop or ordained without a title, to find work where he can. He should be "*admitted*" to "*his function, by laying on of "the handes of the company of the eldership onely.*" "Now there "is . . . required a surples, a vestiment, a pastoral staffe, besides "that ridiculus and (as they use it to their new creatures) "blasphemous saying, receive the holy Ghoste." These demands are interspersed with a great deal of rough denunciation of the existing state of things, and then summed up—

"Your wisdomes have to remove advowsons, patronages, impropriations, and bishops authoritie, claiming to themselves thereby right "to ordayne ministers, and to bring in the old and true election, which "was accustomed to be made by the congregation. . . . Remove "homilies, articles, injunctions, and that prescripte order of service "made out of the masse booke. Take away the Lordshyp, the loytering, the pompe, the idlenesse, and livings of Bishops, but yet employ "them to such ends as they were in the old Church appointed for."

As to the second mark, the sincere ministering of the sacraments, a number of faults are briefly alleged (the allegations being those with which Hooker deals in the Fifth Book) with this practical sequel—

"To redress these, youre wisdomes have to remove (as before) "ignorant ministers, to take away private communions and baptismes, "to enioyne Deacons and Midwives not to meddle in ministers "matters, if they do, to see them sharply punished. To joyne assys- "tance of Elders, and other offycers, that seeing men will not examine "themselves, they may be examined, and brought to render a reason "of theyr hope. . . . That people be apointed to receave the Sacrament "rather sitting, for avoiding of superstition, than kneeling. That "excommunication be restored to his olde former force. . . . Finally, "that nothing be don in this or any other thing, but that which you "have the expresse warrant of God's Worde for<sup>1</sup>."

Concerning the third mark, that of strict ecclesiastical discipline, there is a passage of great importance—

"The officers that have to deale in this Charge are chiefly three,

<sup>1</sup> The importance of this last clause should be marked. It expresses the Puritan principle with which Hooker deals in the Second Book (v. *infra*); that which Professor Briggs calls "the essential principle of Puritanism," p. 29. Cf. Punchard, ii. 480. It was marked by Cranmer, as quoted by R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, iii. 476. "They say "that kneeling is not commanded in "Scripture, and what is not com- "manded in Scripture is unlawful. "There is the root of the error of the "sects." But the most interesting anticipation of both sides in the controversy on this point is to be found in the positions of the Lollards and of Reginald Pecock, arguing against them in his "Repressor of "overmuch blaming of the Clergy" (circa A. D. 1449), for the knowledge of which the present writer is indebted to Mr. Boas. It may be well to quote here the following passage from Mr. Churchill Babington's Introduction to the edition of the work in the Rolls Series:

"The Lollards, against whom "Pecock argues, carried their views "of the sufficiency and completeness "of Scripture so far, that they con- "ceived them to be our only sure "guide in matters in their own nature "indifferent, and required that the

"ritual, as well as the theology of the "Church, should rest upon Scriptural "grounds. When the lawfulness of "any ecclesiastical usage was in "debate, the Lollard would ask, "Where groundest thou it in Scrip- "ture? Against this extreme view "of the sufficiency of Scripture, "Pecock argues in the first part of "his *Repressor* with singular clear- "ness and ability. He maintains at "large that it is not the office of "Scripture to ground any law or "ordinance of God which man's "reason may discover by the light of "nature. He shows likewise that "Scripture presupposes a knowledge "of the moral virtues, and that its "special office is to make known "these truths and articles of faith "which human reason could not "have discovered. In adopting this "line of argument, he may be con- "sidered as the forerunner of Hooker, "who had to contend against pre- "cisely similar opinions maintained "by his puritan opponents. Nor, "perhaps, is it too much to say, with "the lamented Hallam, that this "portion of Pecock's work 'contains "passages well worthy of Hooker, "both for weight of matter and "dignity of style'" (pp. xxviii, xxix. Cf. Hallam, *Middle Ages*, ch. ix. part 2).

"Ministers, preachers, or pastors of whom before; Seniors or elders; and Deacons. Concerning Seniors, not onely theyr office but their name also is out of this English Church utterly removed. Theyr offyce was to governe the Church with the rest of the Ministers, to consult, to admonish, to correct, and to order all thyngs appertaynyng to the state of the congregatyon. In stede of these Segnyors in every Church, the pope hath brought in, and we yet mayntayne, the Lordshyp of one man over many Churches, yea over sondry Shyeres." . . . "Touchyng Deacons, though theyr names be yet remainyng, yet is the offyce fowly perverted and turned upsyde downe." . . . "Now then, if you will restore the Church to his ancient offycers, this you must do. Instead of an Archbishop or Lord Bishop, you must make equalitie of ministers. Insteade of Chancelors, Archdeacons, Offy-cialles, Commissaries, Proctors, Summoners, Churchwardens, and such like, you have to plant in every congregation a lawfull and godly seignorie. The Deaconship must not be confounded with the ministerie, nor the Collectors for the poore may not usurpe the Deacons offyce. . . . And to these three joyntly, that is, the Ministers, Seniors, and Deacons, is the whole regiment of the Churche to be committed. This regiment consisteth especially in ecclesiastical discipline, which is an order left by God unto His Church, wherby men learne to frame their willes and doings according to the law of God, by instructing and admonishing one another, yea and by correcting and punishing all wilfull persons and contemnners of the same. . . . The cheefest parte and laste punishment of this discipline is excommunication."

This passage is followed by a vehement denunciation of the prevalent misuse of excommunication, and by this appeal—

"Amend therefore these horrible abuses, and reforme God's Church, and the Lord is on your right hand, you shall not be removed for ever. . . . Let these things alone, and God is a righteous judge, He wil one day cal you to your reckening. Is a reformation good for France? and can it be evill for Englande? Is discipline meete for Scotland? and is it unprofytable for this realme? Surely God hath set these examples before your eies to encourage you to go forward o a thorow and a spedy reformation."

Thorough and speedy: such was to be the general character o the reformation desired by the writers and supporters of the manifesto; and its details are next shown, in the Second Part of the First Admonition. This second part or treatise gives the

reasons why the Puritan ministers refused to subscribe to the three Articles tendered to them by the High Commissioners in 1571—the Articles which are quoted above.

With regard to the first Article it is pleaded that the Prayer Book is “an unperfect boke, culled and picked out of that “popishe dunghil, the Portuise and Masse boke ful of all “abominations.” Then follows a fierce denunciation of the unpreaching ministry which the Book allows; and then, through twelve pages, a string of indictments against the Prayer Book, point by point. Set homilies, and the Apocryphal Books; Saints’ Days and Vigils, violating the rule “Six days shalt “thou labour”; kneeling to receive the Holy Communion; “the name of priest wherwith he defaceth the minister of Christ”; Private Communion; Private Baptism, and that by women; in Publick Baptism, the questions addressed to the Sponsors, and the Sign of the Cross, whereby “they do superstitiously and wickedly institute a new sacrament”; in Marriage, the wedding ring, “which they fowly abuse and dally withall, in taking it up and laying it downe<sup>1</sup>”; Confirmation, which “as “they use it” is superstitious, “popish and pevishe”; the Burial Service, “wherby praier for the dead is maintained”; Churching of Women, which “smelleth of Jewish purifycation”; tossing the Psalms like tennis-balls; praying that all men may be saved; singing Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis, and Magnificat; “As for “organes and curious singing, thoughe they be proper to Popyshe “dennes, I meane to Cathedrall Churches, yet some others also “must have them”; “their pontificall,” “a thing woorde for “woorde drawne up of the Pope’s pontifycal, wherin he sheweth “himselfe to be Antichrist most lively”; the names of Archbishops, Archdeacons, Lord Bishops, Chancellors, &c.; the Canon Law; the Diocesan authority of Bishops; the civil offices and authority held by Bishops; Ordination of Ministers without a definite cure of souls; Cathedral Churches, as “the “dennes aforsayde of all loytering lubbers” (on these a great deal of grotesque abuse is spent); the Archbishop’s Court, “the fylthy quagmire and poysoned plash of all the abominations “that doe infect the whole realme,” the commissaries’ court, “that

<sup>1</sup> The “abuses accidental” censured under this head, and under the head of burial, are curious instances of popular customs.

"is but a pettie little stinking ditch, that floweth oute of that former great puddle"; the abuses of ecclesiastical discipline and censures in these courts; and lastly the words used in the act of ordaining Priests;—on all these points the Puritans found themselves unable to say that the Prayer Book and its contents were not repugnant to the Word of God.

With regard to the second Article, that in which the apparel of ministers is mentioned, far less is said; but, after a good deal of strong language about the surplice, there is the following important passage: "Neither is the controversie betwixt them and us as they wold beare the world in hand, as for a cap, a tippet, or a surplesse, but for great matters concerning a true ministry and regiment of the Church, according to the Word. Which things once established the others melt away of themselves." This explicit statement of the real point at issue is of great import, especially when it is remembered that this very year, 1572, saw the first constitution of a community or conference for Presbyterian discipline within the Church of England<sup>1</sup>. The main stress of the battle was shifted;—although the prescribed apparel for ministers was still described as "the Garments of the Idole"; and although it was still maintained "therfore can no authoritie by the Word of God, with any pretence of order and obedience, commaund them, nor make them in any wise toller-able, but by circumstances; they are wicked, and against the Word of God."

With regard to the third Article, that which, using the language of 13 Eliz. xii, relates to "the Articles of Religion which only concern the true Christian Faith and the doctrine of the Sacraments," still less is said. The admonitioners are ready to subscribe, "using a godly interpretation in a point or two"—a phrase which seems like a curious anticipation of later controversy. At the same time they would maintain earnestly that "the right government of the Church cannot be separated from the doctrine."

Appended to the Admonition in the manner of a postscript are (1) a brief and not unreasonable defence of the suppression both of the author's and of the printer's names, and (2) two letters written in 1566 by Gualter and Beza, published here

<sup>1</sup> v. *infra*, p. 65.

"because the godly Brethren have been often pressed with "private letters<sup>1</sup>." It appears from the preface to these letters that, though in the copy here used (one of those presented by John Field to his friends) the paging is continuous, the First Admonition had originally appeared alone.

The two little treatises of Exhortation to the Bishops and their Clergy, placed here between the First and Second Admonitions, were clearly published some while after the First Admonition. Field and Wilcox were in Newgate. Some of the Bishops had been preaching about the Admonition as "a very foolish book"; and the writer, taunting them with the fact that, foolish as it is, it is still unanswered, says, "There are scarce so many leaves in "it as there are months past since it came forth," and hints that it is fleeing as a fire-brand from place to place and setting all the country on fire. Both treatises are effectively written: the former of the two appealing to the Bishops to make some effort for the liberation of Field and Wilcox, or at least for the alleviation of their imprisonment; the latter, with a well-sustained attitude of impartial anxiety to see the matter argued out, urging that their book really ought to be answered. Little is, however, added to the delineation of the Puritan platform, save by the vehement insistence on the principle that Church Order must be found wholly and completely in the Scriptures, and judged entirely by them<sup>2</sup>.

It seems to be recognized on all sides that the Second Admonition was the work of Thomas Cartwright; and there is about it a certain sense of importance, an impression of the protagonist coming forward, which well accords with this belief. The danger apprehended and the aim proposed in the undertaking are shown in the Preface—

"We have cast our accompts which do bend ourselves to deale in "these matters, not only to abyde hard wordes, but hard and sharp "dealings also for our laboure: and yet shall we think our laboure well "bestowed if by God hys grace we attayne but to thus much, to give some "light of that reformation of religion which is groundd upon God's "boke, and somewhat to have opened the deformities of our English "reformation, which hyghly displeaseth our Eternal God."

<sup>1</sup> On these two letters cf. Strype's *Life of Parker*, iv. 9.

<sup>2</sup> C. i, ii:

Early in the treatise itself its distinction in character from the First Admonition is marked—that told what should be reformed, this is to tell how the work of reformation should proceed. And as in the First Admonition so here the programme begins boldly: “We are so scarce come to the outward face of a “Church rightly reformed, that although some truth be taught “by some preachers, yet no preacher may without great danger “of the laws utter all truth comprised in the book of God.” With regard to the charge of infringing on the Queen’s supremacy there is a passage which a Tudor was not very likely to read with equanimity: “It is allowed and commanded to “Christian men to try all things and to hold that which is “good, whosoever forbid without exception, Prince, or other, so “that if we examine everything done in this Church of God “in England by the Word of God, and hold that which is good, “though the law be offended, that law is to be reformed and “not we to be punished.” Then the demands begin: “First, “you must provide a sufficient maintenance for the ministry, “that in every parish they may have a preaching pastor, one or “more, that may only intend that Charge.” “Next, you must “repeal your statute or statutes, whereby you have authorized “that ministry that now is, making your estate partly to consist “of Lords Spiritual (as you call them), and making one minister “higher than another.” The ministry comprises only two sorts of ministers, namely, pastors and teachers, “which do not differ “in dignity, but in distinction of office, and exercise of their “gifts, and yet in many things their office is so like that they “are confounded in the name of Elders, as also the governors “are with the ministers in the same name confounded.” A pastor or teacher is to be chosen by the Conference (a body whose constitution and character is presently explained) and approved by the parish; and some one minister from the Conference with the Elders “shall lay their hands on him to signify “to him that he is lawfully called to that parish to be pastor “there or teacher.” The distinct duties of the teacher and the pastor are then shown: the teacher is to devote himself to lecturing and expounding; with a view to maintaining sound doctrine, the natural sense of the Scriptures, and plain proofs of the Articles of the Christian faith; the pastor is to preach,

exhort, admonish, both publicly and privately, to visit the sick, to catechize, to make prayers, to administer the sacraments, examining beforehand the communicants. It is asserted that this is "God's own order set by our Saviour and his Apostles "in his Church"; "the best order, and the only order which "should be in the Church of God." Then follows a long passage in very rough denunciation of existing practices and abuses (the Second Admonition being no nicer in its language than the First), and an appeal to Scripture against the civil authority and lordship of Bishops—God's order is "every one "as good as another amongst the ministers." Then the series of ecclesiastical assemblies is set forth and explained. "A Conference I call the meeting of some certain ministers and other "brethren, as it might be the ministers of London . . . to confer "and exercise themselves in prophesying or interpreting the "Scriptures. . . . At which Conferences any one or any certain of "the brethren are at the order of the whole to be employed upon "some affairs of the Church." . . . And "also the demeanours of "the ministers may be examined and rebuked." "I call that "a Synod provincial which is the meeting of certain of the "Consistory of every parish within a province . . . where great "causes of the Churches which could not be ended in their own "Consistories or Conferences shall be heard and determined." From a Provincial Synod there may be an appeal to a National Synod; and from this again to "a more General Synod of all "Churches." "Whereto they shall stand, as it was at Jerusalem, "except it be a great matter of the faith, or a great matter "expressly against the Scriptures"; in which case the Scripture saith you have one "father, one master, and hear him, and "examine all things, and hold that which is good." In all these conferences and councils the ministers are to go before and guide the other of the assistants and Elders. This scheme is compared with the existing order of things, and the appeal "from one to one till it come to the Pope of Lambeth." There is a good deal of ribald and violent talk about prevalent abuses, especially in regard to patronage; and of the Archbishop and "his confederates" it is said, "they are none other but a remnant "of Antichrist's brood, and God amend them and forgive them, "for else they bid battle to Christ and his Church, and it must

bid the defiance to them till they yield." This is followed by a challenge to "follow the examples which they saw beyond the seas," or to submit the Prayer Book to the judgement of the reformed Churches, or to hold a free conference on the matters in dispute. Then, after some pages in censure of various points in the Prayer Book, and an attack on some of the Bishops as heretical concerning the Sacrament and concerning freewill, the writer comes to the great subject of the Consistory, its constitution and its functions—a subject of the utmost importance in the Puritan platform, and in the "Holy Discipline."

A Consistory should be had in every congregation. It consists first of the ministers of the same congregation, as the guides and mouth of the rest: then of the assistants (afterwards called Elders), "whom the parish shall consent upon and choose," . . . "using the advice of their ministers therein chiefly, and having an eye to a prescript form drawn out of the Scriptures, at the appointment of the Prince and State, by the godly learned men of this realm, because of the rawness of this people yet." When the appointment of these assistants has been published to the parish and consented to, "the minister may lay his hands upon every of them, to testify to them their admission."

The powers of the Consistory are then defined. They do not extend beyond the congregation for which they are appointed; but "these are they in that Church to whom our Saviour com-mandeth them that have twice or oftener admonished an offender, and he heareth them not, to utter such an offender, when he saith, tell the Church (Matt. xviii. 17). These are they whose last admonition he of that Church, or they which regard not, shall be taken as a publican or heathen. These are they that shall admonish all such in that congregation as they know to live with offence to the Church, or as be presented to them, by good testimony of their offence committed. These be they which shall excommunicate the stubborn . . . yet ever so must they excommunicate, and receive the excommunicate in again, that they require the assent of their whole congregation. . . . Nevertheless, what they do well, the congregation cannot alter, neither shall the congregation put them, or any of them out, but upon just cause proved, either in that Consistory or in some one of the Councils, and the cause accepted for sufficient."

Power is also given to the Consistory to abolish unprofitable ceremonies used in place of prayer, to put a stop to "lewd customs" either in games or otherwise, to exercise supervision over the relief of the poor, and to send representatives, with a Deacon or Deacons (that office being defined later on), to a Provincial or National Council.

The fearfulness of excommunication is then shown: the excommunicate being shut out of the Church of God, delivered to Satan, regarded as heathen, severed from the society of all Christian people, save only for the purposes of exhortation to repentance or of necessary affairs in the world, debarred from all other congregations till he has satisfied his own. There is no punishment in this world like it, "but only hell eternally. . . . And besides, "the civil magistrate, the nurse and foster father of the Church, "shall do well to provide some sharp punishment for those that "contemn this censure and discipline of the Church."

The character and office of a Deacon is then described. "A Deacon is an officer of the Church for the behoof of the poor, "chosen to this office by the congregation"; he is to visit the poor, to inquire into their needs, and, in co-operation with the Consistory or with a Provincial Council, to take care for their relief. Deacons of this sort, as distinguished from those recognized in the ordinal and practice of the English Church, there ought to be: "This is "God's order for the poor"; and in the primitive Church there were also widows appointed to minister to the poor and to strangers<sup>1</sup>.

Lastly, the scriptural appointment of this scheme of church government is produced. It is primarily enjoined by four texts:

1. St. Matt xviii. 17: "Tell the Church"; "wherein it is "certain he alludeth to that Consistory of the Jews, and the "Scriptures that direct their government."

2. 1 Tim. v. 17: "Let the elders that rule well be counted "worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the "word and doctrine"; showing "two sorts of elders and rulers, "whereof the one sort also ruleth, but they labour in the word "and doctrine too, and their office is the principal."

<sup>1</sup> This precedent is especially applied to the case of the exiled Protestants of France, Flanders,

Italy, and Spain then in England, and here occurs the passage quoted on p. 29.

3. 1 Cor. xii. 28: "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues<sup>1</sup>."

4. Rom. xii. 6, 7, 8: "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us," &c., "dividing the offices of the Church into two sorts, government and ministering to the poor. To the first office he assigneth doctors, pastors, and governors, calling them by these names, teachers, exhorters, and rulers; and to the second office he assigneth deacons and widows, calling the first those that minister, and the widows those that show mercy<sup>2</sup>."

As showing in action the system thus scripturally enjoined, the following texts are referred to: Acts xiv. 23, xx. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15; 1 Cor. v. 4, 5, xi. 16, xiv. 40; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 8; Acts xv. With regard to the office of a Bishop, a distinction is made: "I do not mean that the Scripture alloweth not a bishop, but not a Lord bishop. A bishop, or overseer, or pastor, and teacher in every congregation the Scripture doth allow<sup>3</sup>, and him or them to be the principal of the Consistory of their congregation it doth allow; but this high Prelacy it alloweth not, but forbiddeth it utterly."

After a fresh burst of denunciation against prevalent abuses, especially those of the Ecclesiastical Courts<sup>4</sup>, the appeal to the

<sup>1</sup> The Puritan use of this text will be found in a treatise to be considered later, Travers' *Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ Explicatio*.

<sup>2</sup> A curious application of another text is tentatively suggested in some MS. Annotations at the end of a volume in the Bodleian (Rawl. 4to, 194). "For a conclusion I will not add a conjecture of mine own, because it is but mine own and a conjecture, and I would not weaken solid arguments with conjectures. But yet (under correction of better judgments) I suppose the four living creatures mentioned by the Apostle John, in his description of the true model and estate of every particular Christian Church standing in purity, do lively

"represent the four sorts of officers in the Church: 1. the Lion expresseth the Ruling Elder; 2. the Calf or Ox the Pastor, that ploweth the field, and treadeth out the corn; 3. the Man, the Deacon, whose care is about the outward man, the human affairs of the Church; treasury and provision for the Poor; 4. the Eagle, the Teacher."

<sup>3</sup> The statement is, of course, in accordance with the use of the word *ἐπίσκοπος* in the Apostolic Age.

<sup>4</sup> It is strange that greater laxity seems to be desired in the matter of divorced persons: "Much more adoe about divorcements than either God or equitie would, restraining both parties from marriage, as long as they bothe are alive togyther."

Queen, the Council, the Nobility, the Commons is renewed. Let them give the case a fair hearing, or procure a free conference about it. The Queen is besought to take the defence of this matter upon her, "and to fortify it by law." For though the orders be and ought to be drawn out of the book of God, "yet it is her majesty that by her princely authority should see every of these things put in practice, and punish those that neglect them." Practical ways of setting forward the desired changes are indicated; amongst others that "her majesty and other that have the gift of benefices are to be desired to depart with it, that in manner as afore the choice of the minister may be free." And so the Second Admonition draws to a close, with prayer to God, with ascription of praise, and, last of all, with a text of warning: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

The little tract or pamphlet (Certain Articles, &c.) with which the volume ends had come anonymously into Cartwright's hands, and he "thought good to impart it" to the Christian reader. It is even more bitter and scurrilous than anything that has preceded it. It appears from Strype's *Annals*<sup>1</sup> that Archbishop Parker had had extracts made from the First Admonition, possibly with a view to Whitgift's answering it. These extracts had come into the hands of a Puritan writer, and he prints a number of them with short, scornful comments on them. He adds but little to the delineation of the Puritan position, and he writes without any especial weight, Cartwright not knowing who he was; but one point is noteworthy. With regard to the assertion that the authors of the Admonition would not have the ministers tied "to any form of prayers invented by man," he answers, "Utterly falsified. There is no such thing meant, that there should be none at all, but that this of theirs ought not to be tolerated. A form of prayers they deny not. Nay, we do use one in our congregations, and the same that all reformed Churches do." A suggestive note is added to the list of misprints in the volume: "The cause of which faults (good Christian reader) and some other things not published, which we meant and mind to publish God willing, is the importunate search of Day the Printer

<sup>1</sup> Bk. i. ch. 20, and Appendix, No. xix.

"and Toy the Bookbinder, assisted with a pursuivant, and some other officers at the appointment of the bishops<sup>1</sup>."

Such were the proposals for reformation which were being pressed upon England during the period with which the student of Hooker is most closely concerned; and a true estimate of them is essential to the full appreciation of Hooker's work. The intemperance with which they were expressed should not be allowed to obscure their real importance. Intemperate language hindered a movement in the sixteenth century far less than it does now; and the demands made in the Admonitions were soon to receive a more scholarly form, and to be set to work in a more business-like way. The Admonitions were fortunate in their opportunity for making a wide stir; for the recent rebellion in the north, the Pope's Bull for the release of the Queen's subjects from their allegiance, the rumours of invasion and revolt, the activity of papal agents in England, and the massacre at Paris all helped to prepare a welcome in uncritical minds for any scheme which promised to "remove whole Antichrist both head and tail"; while flagrant abuses among Churchmen<sup>2</sup> gave a rightful power to the cry for real and effective discipline. It is clear that the Admonitions, unworthy as they were to represent a serious and religious movement, speedily laid hold upon the public mind and took a place of great importance among the contending forces of the day. The rapid spread of the book has already been noticed. All efforts to check its printing and circulation were baffled; it seems to have been the special theme of inquiry when certain Puritans were brought before the Council and before the Ecclesiastical Commission in 1573<sup>3</sup>; Field and Wilcox, who had been imprisoned for their share in it, found people resorting to them "as in Popery they were wont to run on Pilgrimages<sup>4</sup>," while Cartwright was no less in request; it was openly upheld "as the true Platform of the Sincere and Apostolical "Church" by two preachers whom the Bishop of London had incautiously invited to preach at St. Paul's Cross, and ineffectually tried to arrest after their sermons; and when a royal proclamation, bearing date June 11, 1573, required that all copies of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype's Life of Parker, iv. 19 (anno 1572).  
9, ad init.

<sup>3</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, iv. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Strype's Life of Parker, iv. <sup>4</sup> Cf. Neal, i. 261.

the Admonition and of books in defence of it should be brought in to the Bishop of the Diocese or to the Privy Council, the Bishop of London wrote to the Lord Treasurer that not one book had been brought in to him in the prescribed period<sup>1</sup>. Clearly the Admonitions did not need the voluminous controversy which they provoked between Whitgift and Cartwright to secure prominence in the agitation, the talk, the history of Hooker's time.

Amidst a medley of matters widely different in importance there stand out certain points which were steadily characteristic of the fully developed Puritan position; and they show the reality of that which Hooker resisted on behalf of the English Church. Four such points seem to be of eminent significance.

1. The first is the demand for equality of ministers. The title or office of a Bishop may be retained, but only as synonymous with that of Pastor or Teacher. The order of Bishops is held to be contrary to the Scriptures; the act of Ordination is to be the act of the Ministers and Elders; and no minister is to use or challenge any authority outside his own charge, save through the action of the Synod of which he may be a member. There are to be only two sorts of ministers, namely Pastors and Teachers, equal in dignity, differing only in work.

2. Secondly, all members of the Church are to be subject to the discipline of the Consistory. The aim of this discipline is the bridling of those who are disorderly; its authority is to be enforced, if necessary, by excommunication; contempt of it should be sharply punished by the civil magistrate, whose action in regard to the affairs of the Church should be directed by the decisions of the Church<sup>2</sup>.

3. Thirdly, the breach with the past is to be complete. The English Church as it is to be detested with a perfect hatred; those who were priests under Henry VIII and Mary ought to be utterly removed; the prescript order of service taken out of the Mass Book ought to go, with all that recalled the worship of the unreformed Church.

<sup>1</sup> Strype's Parker, iv. 26, 24. But cf. Neal, i. 261.

<sup>2</sup> This claim, which is sufficiently indicated in the Admonitions (v. *supra*, p. 48), is further developed in the work next to be considered, the Full and Plaine Declaration of

Ecclesiasticall Discipline. In regard to the authority and action of the Consistory the Puritans would probably not have hesitated to recognize Geneva in Calvin's time as showing what they meant.

4. Fourthly, no ordinance can stand in the Church unless it is expressly appointed in Scripture. Nothing must be done but that for which the express warrant of God's Word can be adduced.

The scheme thus characterized was to be established and enforced by the authority of the Crown; it was to supersede the existing Church of England; it was to be the defined and authorized form of religion for the Queen's subjects; and neither the temper of the times, the nature and affinities of the scheme, nor the language of its champions promised much liberty of divergence from it.—There may have been much that was faulty in the arguments, the policy, the motives of those who opposed it, as well as much that was sincere and excellent in the enthusiasm of those who contended for it; the time was a time of tangled strife, and primary importance was often attached to subordinate matters; the points in controversy were multitudinous, and there was much misplacing of emphasis, and some stood out stiffly when they might have yielded wisely, and others claimed the shelter of authority for selfish interests and indefensible abuses. But through all the confusion and misunderstanding the ultimate question at issue in the Puritan controversy of Hooker's day was not whether the Prayer Book should be altered here and there, nor whether larger allowance should be made for those who resented its requirements. It was a question which presupposed the conviction that the religious life of a nation must have a uniform expression; it was the question whether the religious life of England should be expressed in the continuance of the historic Church of England, or in a system such as Calvin had established at Geneva.

It was said above that the Platform displayed in the Admonitions was soon presented after a more scholarly fashion. The wide influence and the curious history of the treatise in which this was done may warrant some length in the description of it. About two years had passed since the publication of the Admonitions—years of wide and varied activity in the cause of change, and of strenuous efforts to enforce conformity<sup>1</sup>. In 1574 there appeared in two forms a little volume entitled *Ecclesiasticæ*

<sup>1</sup> The Queen seems at this period to have pressed matters forward with especial strenuousness. Cf. Neal, i. 269.

Disciplinæ et Anglicanæ Ecclesiæ ab illa aberrationis plena e Verbo Dei et dilucida explicatio:—Rupellæ, excudebat Adamus de Monte. MDLXXIII: or, A Full and Plaine Declaration of Ecclesiasticall Discipline owt off the word off God, and off the declininge off the Church off England from the same: Imprinted MDLXXIII. Both the Latin original and the English translation were printed abroad. The author's name was concealed; but the Latin treatise was confidently and steadily attributed to Walter Travers<sup>1</sup>; while the Preface attached to it was believed to be the work of Thomas Cartwright<sup>2</sup>, who has been also credited with the English translation<sup>3</sup>. The title-page of this translation (1574) bears no printer's name, nor indication of the press, and the volume is very rare<sup>4</sup>. A second edition of this translation, somewhat carelessly prepared, was printed at Geneva in 1580; and it is probably to this edition that Bancroft, in his *Survey* (p. 180), and Whitgift, in his letter to Beza<sup>5</sup>, refer; and in 1617 it appeared again, with somewhat more careful revision though far less attractive type, from some unnamed press. But meanwhile, in 1584, there had been a far more conspicuous and important issue of the book. Towards the end of 158 $\frac{3}{4}$  the Cambridge University Press, after more than fifty years of abeyance, was, by the sanction of the Chancellor, Burghley, in spite of the vehement antagonism of the Stationers' Company

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Whitgift to Burghley in 1584 (Strype's Whitgift, i. 344), an Epistle to the terrible Priests (Martin Marprelate, 1588), p. 35, ed. 1843; Sutcliffe, *A Treatise of Ecclesiasticall Discipline*, pp. 102, 178 (1590); *Opinions of the Chief Justices, in regard to the practices of certain Puritans* (1590) in Strype's Whitgift, App. vol. iii. p. 236; Whitgift to Beza, 1593, *ibid.* ii. 165; Bancroft, *A Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, pp. 73, 190, 236 (1593). The belief seems to have been prevalent and unchallenged in controversy, and may probably be accepted as true; although in a copy of the Latin edition of 1574, sold in the Napier sale at Sotheby's in London, March, 1886, was a note: "Laurentius 'Tompsonus Oxoniensis theologus 'doctissimus est hujus libri author,

"1574" (v. Cat. Bodl. Libr., Tomson). Cf. Keble's *Hooker*, i. 59, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sutcliffe, *A Treatise, &c.*, pp. 5, 178; Strype's Whitgift, App. to bk. iv. No. iii. marginal note; Strype's *Annals*, anno 1584, p. 285; J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, vol. ii. p. 302; B. Brook, *Memoir of Thomas Cartwright*, p. 243.

<sup>3</sup> Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, vol. ii. pp. 263, 631, 632.

<sup>4</sup> It contains, between the Preface and the treatise, *A Table or Short View of all Ecclesiastical Discipline ordeined by the Word of God*. This is given in the 1617 reprint, but not in the copies of the Latin of 1574 and of the English of 1580 which the present writer has seen.

<sup>5</sup> Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, ii. 165, 169.

and the uneasiness of the ecclesiastical authorities, definitely re-established, the office of University Printer being confirmed to Thomas Thomas, a fellow of King's College<sup>1</sup>. Among the very first books which appeared in 1584<sup>2</sup> from the press thus sanctioned was an edition in English of Travers' treatise; whereupon Whitgift wrote at once to Burghley in strong remonstrance. "Ever sens "I hard" (he says) "that they had a printer at Chambridg "I did greatlie fear this and such like inconveniences wold "followe"; and he goes on to urge that the book should be burnt, being "verie factius and full of untruthes," and "the same "which Travers ys supposed to have sett forth in Laten, without "anie addition or retraction<sup>3</sup>." The suppression thus prompted was so earnestly carried out that no copy of the unhappy volume is known to exist. It is generally spoken of as though it were a new translation; but it seems more probable that it was only a re-issue of that which had appeared in 1574 and 1580; for a quotation and an important omission which Bancroft<sup>4</sup> expressly connects with Travers' "Translator in Cambridge" are to be found, exactly correspondent, in those earlier editions.

So far as the present writer is aware no edition of Travers' treatise, either in Latin or in English, appeared after that of 1617. Anyhow, it is a grave blunder (for which Strype<sup>5</sup> and Neal<sup>6</sup> must share the blame) to have identified it with the document "published by authority" in 1644, and entitled "A Directory of Church Government," this being, as will per-

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, i. 626; ii. 292-297; Strype's *Annals*, bk. i. ch. 17. The date of the Chancellor's letter conveying his assent is March 18, 1583. For Thomas' fitness for his office (in spite of the disparaging assertions both of the Stationers' Company and of Bp. Aylmer), cf. R. Bowes, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society's Publications*, vol. v. pt. iv. pp. 292-294. For the theological sympathy attributed to him, cf. Martin Marprelate's *Epistle to the terrible Priests*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> It is placed first of all by Ames, v. Herbert's Ames, iii. 1414. Cf. also Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, i. 299 (where, however, the book is confused with

that presented to the House of Commons in 1584), and J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, ii. 302-304.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted from Mullinger, ii. 304.

<sup>4</sup> *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, pp. 237, 225 (ed. 1593). Cf. *A Full and Plaine Declaration, &c.*, ed. 1574, pp. 125, 153; and ed. 1580, pp. 128, 159. Also the Latin ed. 1574, pp. 96, 119. The great importance of these passages lies in their affording proof that it *was* Travers' *Eccl. Disc. Explicatio*, and not the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*, which appeared at Cambridge.

<sup>5</sup> *Life of Whitgift*, i. 345.

<sup>6</sup> *History of the Puritans*, i. 391.

sently be shown, the reproduction of another and distinct work<sup>1</sup>: a work to which the title of the Book of Discipline, sometimes loosely used of the Explicatio or Declaration, will here be confined.

The author of the Explicatio, Walter Travers, was well qualified for the eminence and influence which he shared with Thomas Cartwright. The two men stood together as leaders of the English Puritans, and in their strength and in their limitations there seems a marked likeness between them.

Travers must have been somewhat senior to Hooker, for he had taken his degree at Cambridge before Hooker went up to Oxford. He was qualified to become a Fellow of Trinity before Whitgift became master of that great Society—that is to say, before 1567. There is no question as to the reality of his intellectual power, the depth of his learning, the genuineness of his piety, the height of his personal character. From all sources, English, Scotch, and Irish, by all sorts of men, whether they agreed or contended with him, this is amply attested. He was able, learned, and unworldly. But one thing he does not seem to have learnt, namely, how to work with other men. He seems to have belonged to that well-marked class of whom Hooker speaks, the class of men who “breed disturbance by following “the law of private reason, where the law of public should take “place”; those “whose betters amongst men would be hardly “found, if they did not live amongst men, but in some wilderness “by themselves<sup>2</sup>.” Of course, Archbishop Whitgift’s testimony may be challenged on the ground that he and Travers were opponents: but Whitgift would hardly make a false statement as to the plain facts of Travers’ Cambridge career, and Whitgift writes to Lord Burghley:

“Mr. Travers is to no man better known, I think, than to myself. “I did elect him Fellow of Trinity College, being before rejected by “Dr. Beaumont for his intolerable stomach: whereof I had also after-

<sup>1</sup> Attention seems to have been first drawn to this mistake by “P.L.” (the late Principal Lorimer) in the introduction to the reprint of this Directory (which is also reprinted as App. i. to Dr. Briggs’ *American Presbyterianism*, q. v.), published by Nisbet for the Synod of the Presby-

terian Church in England in 1872. Dr. Briggs seems to overstate the degree of connexion between Travers’ book and the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*, or Book of Discipline, or Directory of Church Government.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, I. xvi. 6.

"wards such experience, that I was forced by due punishment so to weary him, till he was fain to travel. . . . Neither was there ever any under our government, in whom I found less submission and humility than in him. Nevertheless if time and years have now altered that disposition (which I cannot believe, seeing yet no token thereof, but rather the contrary), I will be as ready to do him good as any friend he hath."

This is the witness of an opponent, but neither of an irresponsible nor an intemperate opponent. And it is confirmed by other indications, especially by Travers' own unreasonable bitterness against his old University, with which he includes Oxford in a savage and extravagant invective—an invective in strange contrast with the judgement of others in his day. He imagines Henry VIII (whom he designates as a Hercules among the heroes) rebuking the Universities because they have become "the skulking places of drones, monasteries of yawning, snoring monks, trees not only barren but baneful with their poisonous shade to all the plants that grow up under them." Such language would have been at any time out of place in a theological treatise; in 1574 it could hardly but be the language of an unreasonably angry man<sup>1</sup>. One feels that though Travers may indeed have been an ornament to the society which numbered him among its fellows, he may also at times have been a trial to it; and one is not surprised to find that when, under the conditions of academic life in those days, his opinions came into irreconcilable conflict with Whitgift's resolute will, there was not room for both in the same College. Travers betook himself to Geneva, and there became intimate with Beza, returning however to Cambridge for a short while. In 1572 he bore part in that important and fruitful meeting at Wandsworth, to which allusion has already been made<sup>2</sup>, and of which more will presently be said. In 1574 he produced the book now to be brought under consideration—a book which has recently been described as an "epoch-making treatise, which in the latter part of the sixteenth and earlier half of the

<sup>1</sup> Mullinger, *History of the University of Cambridge*, ii. 262-4, 273, 4. Attention may be also directed to the guarded panegyric of Archbp. Loftus, Mullinger, ii. 355, and to

Travers' dealing with Hooker, cf. Hooker's *Answer to Travers*, in Keble's *Hooker*, vol. iii. §§ 4, 5, 25.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 43.

"seventeenth century exercised an influence on religious thought  
"in England unsurpassed by that of any other single work<sup>1</sup>."

Cartwright's somewhat florid preface to the book tells of his surprise that whereas men submitted patiently to the harsh discipline of Rome, that sweet and salutary discipline which is now proffered to them has found so little welcome; of his fear lest vengeance should come on England if this refusal is continued; of his trust that the granting of so excellent a workman for the fresh presentation of the discipline may be a sign of Divine favour to the country; and of his hope that coming in so noble and attractive and uncontroversial a form it may at last secure due recognition and acceptance even by the most critical, and especially by one of learning and classical taste so remarkable (in a woman) as that of Elizabeth.

The book begins with an effective insistence on the interdependence of doctrine and discipline. Ecclesiastical discipline is "the polity of the Church of Christ ordained and appointed  
"of God for the good administration and government of the  
"same"; and "the manner of government in all human societies  
"is of the greatest force and power either to the preservation or  
"overthrow of the same." Here then is the danger of the Church of England: that whatever reformation has been effected is incomplete and insecure, because doctrine has been severed from discipline; discipline has been left unreformed, and therefore the reform of doctrine is precarious. For discipline and doctrine are like the twins mentioned by Hippocrates who always got sick or well together.

What is needed then is a new reformation, dealing with the discipline of the Church. And the first thing is to make a clean sweep of the canon law—out of which (as out of a Trojan

<sup>1</sup> Mullinger, *History of the University of Cambridge*, ii. 291. The owner in 1588 of a copy of the first edition (now owned by the present writer) has written at the beginning of the book some curious Latin verses:—

"Odere nomen angue pejus et  
cane:

"Quod? DISCIPLINÆ: Qui?  
sinistri homines, male

"Sani, impotentes, detegi scelus  
suum

"Ægre ferentes, et verentes corripi.  
"Odere suave Disciplinæ isti  
jugum,

"Animo ægri (at ingenti malo næ,  
næ, suo)

"Uri, secari respuunt, renuunt,  
male!

"Ergo magis magisque sordescant.  
Dari

"Beneficium invito haud solet,  
debet neque."

horse) have come archbishops, lord bishops, chancellors, archdeacons, "et reliquæ sordes"; by whom the Church has been taken and enslaved—and then to establish the true and right discipline, based upon the principle "that all things be exacted as "near as may be unto the Word of God," and that nothing be admitted save what can be confirmed by the voice and witness of God Himself<sup>1</sup>.

This scheme of discipline or polity is then set forth. It must include those who bear office in the Church and those who do not, but are as plain citizens of the Church. Offices are either extraordinary, such as those which have ceased since the apostolic age (those of the apostles, evangelists, prophets, with the gifts of healing, &c.), or ordinary, such as are perpetual in the Church. The ordinary offices are either simple (i. e. borne by individuals) or composite (borne by assemblies). The simple offices are those of Bishops (or ministers), whether they be doctors or pastors<sup>2</sup>, and of deacons, whether they be deacons strictly so called (set over the property of the Church), or elders (a second sort of deacons, appointed to take heed of the offences that arise in the Church). The composite offices of the Church are, first, those of the ecclesiastical senate (or presbytery), composed of the pastors, doctors, and elders entrusted with the election of ministers (subject to the assent of the congregation) and with the correction of offenders; and secondly, those of conferences and synods—provincial, national, and international—for the administrative work of the Church.

The scheme is thus substantially identical with that proposed in the Admonitions; but it is far more systematically set forth and defended, though some parts are treated much less fully than others. Concerning the whole matter of synods the reader is referred to other treatises, and the position of the "citizens" in the ecclesiastical polity is briefly, though impressively, defined. A few points in the book require special notice.

The greater portion of it is devoted to the simple offices of the Church, and especially to the office of a Bishop or minister<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Note again "the essential principle of Puritanism." Cf. *supra*, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> On p. 145 b a certain precedence in dignity is given to the pastors; cf. also 141 b.

<sup>3</sup> "Est autem Episcopus, si vere illum definire volumus, minister Ecclesiæ in rebus divinis, et ad Deum pertinentibus," 57 b.

Stress is laid on the necessity of an inward calling, and of a right election and ordination to these offices. The election is to be preceded by a careful examination as to faith and character. and it is to be made by the senate<sup>1</sup>; it is then to be submitted to the rest of the Church for their approval; it may be rescinded if they disapprove and show just cause for their disapproval. Ordination is the setting apart of one so chosen to his office, or, as it were, a kind of investing him with it; and it consists of two ceremonies, prayer and the laying-on of hands. The laying-on of hands has in ordination two special uses: for the man who is ordained, it marks that he is taken and set apart by the hand of God Himself for His work, and that that hand will be with him in bearing the burden it has imposed upon him; for the Church, it marks that the authority of the minister is from God, and that he is therefore to be obeyed in those things which pertain to his office. The power of ordination rests neither with the whole body of the Church nor with any individual, but with the ecclesiastical senate.

There is much that is fine and just in the delineation of that which the sacred ministry requires, much that is earnest as well as much that is vehement and bitter in the denunciation of abuses and the cry for amendment; and it is clear that the reformation which is here demanded is to be no less thorough and sweeping than that for which the Admonitions called<sup>2</sup>. It would be impossible to convey briefly and adequately the course of thought throughout the book, and it does not materially swerve from the lines already shown. But on two subjects there are passages of special importance: they are the functions of the ecclesiastical senate and the position of the laity.

The ecclesiastical senate is the body called by St. Paul *πρεσβυτέριον*: it is that which is spoken of by our Lord as "the Church" in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew: "Tell it unto the Church: but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him

<sup>1</sup> "Senatus iste qui ordinariam in omnibus rebus gerendis in Ecclesia potestatem habet" (p. 40 b, ed. 1574). Apparently the Consistory is meant. In the case of Doctors a different procedure seems to be

allowed: "Quam (electionem) ab Academia factam . . . non improbarim," 109 b.

<sup>2</sup> The demand for University reform on pp. 110 seq. is interesting.

"be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican": that to which He gives authority to pardon or not to pardon sins; "nor can it be doubted that when those whom He has equipped with His own authority, and to whom He has in a certain way entrusted this key," ("of the house of David, which is the Church of God"), "shut or open heaven, it is open and accessible, or shut and inaccessible<sup>1</sup>." All the affairs of the church<sup>2</sup> fall within the range of its authority; but attention is here directed especially to its dealing with offences and offenders. It may deal with them either by word or by some spiritual punishment, such as concerns the eternal life, not touching the things of this life, the sphere of the civil magistrate. An instance of the dealing by word is seen in the rebuke and command given by the Jewish elders to Peter and John in Acts iv—a rebuke and command wrongly given, yet illustrating the form of Church government which our Saviour has transferred to us. Of spiritual punishments the first is suspension, which is an order to abstain for a certain time from the reception of sacraments. This has its parallel in the Jewish Church; but it must be remembered that our dispensation is more august than that of Judaism, and therefore our sacraments must be regarded more anxiously and carefully, and none should be admitted to them save after diligent inquiry as to the faith they hold, the religion they observe, the God they worship; nor should any be admitted who, though they be children of the covenant, have been guilty of any offence requiring suspension. The second spiritual punishment is excommunication, which is the censure of the Church whereby any one who has been guilty of some grave crime or wickedness is excluded, with no prescription of a definite time, from the sacred things, and banished from the fellowship of the faithful. This also rests on, and has been transferred to us from, the discipline of the Jews; some even trace it back to the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Eden, and to the driving out of Cain from the presence of the Lord; it has its clear parallel in that cutting off and exclusion from the people of God which was ordained in the Law, and which our Lord (St. Matt. xviii) and St. Paul (1 Cor. v) mark as carried on into the Christian Church. The effect of

<sup>1</sup> Translated from p. 125 a.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently used here for the particular congregation.

excommunication is to cut off the excommunicate from the chosen people and the Church, from the hope and expectation of the promises, from the signs and seals thereof; so that he loses all the rights of the city of God and is cast out of the kingdom of God into the kingdom of darkness and uttermost bondage; since there is no middle state. In the wielding of so tremendous a weapon there must be the utmost care, with trying of all other means first, and sorrow of the whole Church when the blow has to fall. In the papal oppression it has been shamefully misused for light offences; but the sin of negligence, in not bringing it to bear where it is needed, is not much less than that of levity and temerity in using it. It is doubtful whether the execration of which St. Paul speaks in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians and in the last chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians properly belongs to the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline.

From this consideration of the authority of the ecclesiastical senate it appears that the constitution of the Church is aristocratic, or rather theocratic; though it is tempered with a democratic element, in that those who hold this authority must understand that they are to do nothing violent or tyrannical, but to attach to their authority the assent of the people.

The position of those who hold no office in the Church was to be the subject of the second part of the treatise, but it is relegated to its last few pages. Their duty is easily and willingly to let themselves be ruled and governed by those whom God has set over them. Magistrates are not to think themselves exempt from this commandment of obedience. The authorities of the Church represent Christ; and it is right therefore that even kings should obey them, after the examples of Uzziah, Philip, and Theodosius. Magistrates have indeed this proper and peculiar duty in regard to the Church, that by their authority they should establish and protect it, not dealing with its affairs, but taking care that the worship of God is set up according to His commandment, ministered by the right hands, and preserved in sincere purity. Of this princely care for the establishment or restoration of true religion there are great examples in the Old Testament; and it must be remembered that true religion includes not only sound doctrine, but also the due order of ecclesiastical offices,

of Church government, of discipline for the correction and removal of offences.

Such were the proposals of the Puritans for the speedy and thorough reformation which they desired. Travers and Cartwright were well qualified to do justice to the scheme they advocated, and the book which has just been considered shows ability and power. But it is improbable that the movement would ever have come so near success as thoughtful men clearly believed that it was coming had it relied only on scholarly treatises and admonitions to the Parliament. Concurrently with such efforts there was going on throughout the country a steady endeavour to reduce the difference between the Church of England and the Puritan ideal, to draw the affections and hopes of men and women in all classes towards the Puritan discipline and worship, and secretly to introduce into the existing structure of the Church as much as possible of the Puritan system. This endeavour was for the most part carried on quietly, if not stealthily; and those who were concerned in it must be distinguished not only from the Brownists, who, with their cry of "Reformation without tarrying for any," renounced all communion with the Church of England, and proclaimed "the wickedness of those Preachers which will not reform themselves and their charge, because they will tarry till the magistrate command and compel them"<sup>1</sup>; but also from the milder Separatists of the period immediately following the issue of the Advertisements—Separatists such as were arrested, interrogated, and imprisoned in connexion with the meeting at Plumbers' Hall in 1567<sup>2</sup>. For the proceedings now to be considered were intended to avoid present severance and to work a gradual reformation, and they were regarded as consistent with the holding of a benefice and with outward conformity more or less complete. In Fuller's phrase "the grand design was . . . to set up a discipline in a discipline, presbytery in episcopacy"—a design which probably took form by degrees, but which came to be a very definite, practical, and effective organization for getting the Puritan platform into

<sup>1</sup> These two phrases tell the subject of the famous treatise put forth by Robert Brown in 1582. Cf. Neal, i. 328-332; Punchard, iii. 17; Hooker,

Preface, ch. viii. § 1, and especially note on p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Strype's *Life of Parker*, bk. iii. ch. 16.

the established framework with the hope that presently the latter might disappear and the former take its place: somewhat as in the shifting of dissolving views the new picture, mingling at first unnoticed, or scarcely noticed, with its predecessor, asserts itself more and more until at length it holds the field as the last lines of that which was there melt away and cease to interfere with it<sup>1</sup>. The points at which this plan of campaign appears are interesting and important; for they illustrate what was probably the most resultful activity in the movement with which Hooker had to deal, and they show the environment of a somewhat remarkable document, presently to be considered.

The system of prophesyings probably began (in 1571) with little or no reference to the Puritan scheme; it was upheld by most of the Bishops, and from time to time regulated with a special view to the exclusion of ecclesiastical politics and inflammatory matters; it seems to have been a sincere attempt to secure in the Church a better state of discipline and an increase of religious knowledge and of the study of the Scriptures. The prophesyings were exercises practised at periodical meetings of *classes* of the clergy, under the control of a moderator; a confession of faith, severely protestant in character, was signed by all members on their admission to the *classis*; laymen, it seems, were allowed to be present, but not to speak; a passage of Scripture, previously selected, was expounded, and the exposition was supplemented by subsequent speakers; the moderator summed up; and the whole exercise lasted two hours<sup>2</sup>. There was indisputably great need for advance in discipline and learning among the clergy, and many who were likely to judge well spoke with high praise of the prophesyings. But the institution was dangerously handy for use in such a method as the Puritans were now adopting, and there seems little doubt that they used it in some cases for the propagation of their principles and system<sup>3</sup>. From the first the Queen seems to have been led to regard the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church*, p. 450 and note 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Neal, i. 243, 286, 309, 310.

<sup>3</sup> The similar arrangement of *classes* in the organization of the prophesyings, in the Conclusions drawn up by Cartwright and Travers (cf. *infra*, p. 67), and in the Disci-

plina Ecclesiæ Sacra (cf. *infra*, p. 73), is noteworthy. Punchard (ii. 493, note) goes so far as to say that "it is doubtful whether it" (the Wadsworth Presbytery of 1572) "was in its design anything more than a modification of the Northampton associational scheme."

prophesyings with some apprehension<sup>1</sup>: in 1574 it was clear that they had been misused in the diocese of Norwich; and, in spite of opposition from the Bishop of Norwich and the Privy Council, the Archbishop enforced the suppression of them<sup>2</sup>. Somewhat later there was an alarm about them in Northampton and Warwickshire<sup>3</sup>: the tenor of the regulations issued by those Bishops who most favoured them may fairly be said to show at least the quarter from which misuse seemed most to be apprehended<sup>4</sup>: and the determination with which, in 1577, they were at length put down, in spite of all that Grindal's courage could interpose, is hard to account for, unless there was some truth in the charge that they were an implement of the Puritan agitation<sup>5</sup>.

In 1572, the year after the prophesyings began, a great step was taken, a step thought worthy in 1872 of a tercentenary commemoration<sup>6</sup>. A number of the Puritan leaders, including Field, Wilcox, and Travers, determined to form a presbytery secretly at Wandsworth: "on the 20th of November eleven" elders were chosen, and their offices described in a register, "intituled The Orders of Wandsworth." "This," says Fuller, in words often quoted, "was the first-born of all presbyteries in England, and *secundum usum Wandsworth* as much honoured "by some as *secundum usum Sarum* by others<sup>7</sup>." The words would bear some thinking over, and probably they do not overstate what was intended. For henceforward a Presbyterian organization was being quietly extended through the Church of England by her own ministers, the Wandsworth Presbytery securing not entire secrecy indeed, but immunity and successful imitation.

A curious Protestation of the Puritans, printed by Strype, and reprinted by Neal, comes close to this date, and was probably connected with some of these private associations. But it seems to have been drawn up for those who contemplated more severance from the Church of England than was in the minds

<sup>1</sup> Neal, i. 245.

<sup>2</sup> Strype's Parker, bk. iv. ch. 37.

<sup>3</sup> Neal, i. 303.

<sup>4</sup> Neal, i. 309.

<sup>5</sup> Neal, i. 310-314.

<sup>6</sup> In connexion with this Tercenary Commemoration the transla-

tion of the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra* was reprinted from the edition of 1644.

<sup>7</sup> Neal, i. 266; Fuller, bk. ix. p. 103; cf. Punchard, ii. 492, 493, and note.

of men like Travers. For it contains, with a vehement denunciation of the "Popish garments," a list of the reasons why the signatories, notwithstanding the danger of not coming to the parish church, "come not back again to the Preaching, &c., of "them that have received these marks of the Romish Beast." "Moreover," it continues, "I have now joined myself to the "Church of Christ. Wherein I have yielded myself subject to "the Discipline of God's Word, as I promised at my Baptism. "Which if I should now again forsake, and join myself with "their Traditions, I should forsake the Union, wherein I am knit "to the Body of Christ, and join myself to the Discipline of "Antichrist." A note appended to the paper by the Archbishop states that "In this Protestation the Congregation singularly did "swear, and after took the Communion for Ratification of their "assent<sup>1</sup>." Those who so protested must have meant (as Strype indeed implies<sup>2</sup>) to erect their own system over against the Church which they denounced rather than to intrude it gradually with any measure of conformity to shelter it. But it is possible that, in the earlier stages of the conflict, such differences of policy were not very sharply distinguished, provided nonconformity stopped short of complete and avowed separation<sup>3</sup>.

The most interesting delineation of the methods adopted by the chief leaders in the movement is given in the conclusions reached after a series of important meetings in Suffolk, at Cambridge, and at London. These conclusions are said to have been "given to the ministers for their direction in their several "parishes<sup>4</sup>"; and they illustrate clearly what was going on, and how the characteristic features of the Puritan discipline were to be observed under the episcopal forms. The calling and election of ministers was to be secured by requiring that no man should *offer himself* to the ministry, and that when any one was called by a Church he should impart it to the *classis* or *conference* of which he was a member, and then, if approved by that body, be commended to the Bishop for ordination. The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype's Life of Parker, bk. iv. ch. 28; Neal, i. 283.

<sup>2</sup> Life of Parker, iv. 28. "Besides "this establishment of private, separate Congregations, they had thus "far advanced their Platform more

"publicly, that even in Parishes the "Disciplinarians had planted Ministers."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Punchard, iii. 444.

<sup>4</sup> Neal, i. 303.

office of elders was to be provided for by arranging that men likely to act as elders should be elected as churchwardens. Deacons, in the Puritan sense of the title, were to be got by taking similar care in regard to the election of collectors for the poor. The periodical assemblies of *classes* (or conferences) and provincial, comital, and national synods were to be arranged by "a distribution of all Churches, according to the "rules set down in the synodical discipline." The extension of the system was to be advanced by the *classes* dealing earnestly with patrons to present fit men. Thus at point after point the Genevan system was to be pushed forward in the established Church, and the forms of the Church bent as near as might be to the Genevan type; this was to be done by men who were holding office in the Church; and it was agreed that "those "ceremonies in the Book of Common Prayer, which being taken "from popery are in controversy, ought to be omitted, if it may "be done without danger of being put from the ministry; but "if there be imminent danger of being deprived, then let the "matter be communicated to the *classis* in which that Church "is, to be determined by them<sup>1</sup>."

A curious instance of the practice of the policy thus planned comes to light in the controversy between Travers and Hooker. Travers had been for some while Reader at the Temple when Hooker was by the Queen in 1585 appointed Master. The form of the appointment was normal and complete; but Travers and some of his friends wanted to attach to it such a calling as the Puritans would have required in all cases. What happened will be best told in Hooker's words.

"The evening before I was first to preach, he (Travers) came, and "two other gentlemen joined with him in the charge of this church (for "so he gave me to understand), though not in the same kind of charge "with him<sup>2</sup>: the effect of his conference then was, that he thought "it his duty to advise me not to enter with a strong hand, but to "change my purpose of preaching there the next day, and to stay till "he had given notice of me to the congregation, so that their allowance "might seal my calling. The effect of mine answer was, that as in

<sup>1</sup> Neal, i. 303-305.

<sup>2</sup> The phrase suggests that they act, among the like-minded, as lay-elders.

"place where such order is, I would not break it; so here where it never was, I might not of mine own head take upon me to begin it: but liking very well the motion, for the opinion which I had of his good meaning who made it, requested him not to mislike my answer, though it were not correspondent to his mind."

The answer seems neither unreasonable nor discourteous, and Hooker might probably have added that the Queen would be likely to resent the subjection of her grant to be sealed by the allowance of the congregation. But his refusal was taken amiss, and he says that Travers afterwards spoke of his "entering into this charge by virtue only of a human creature (for so the want of that formality of popular allowance was then censured<sup>1</sup>)."

It also appears, from a later passage in the same paper, that Travers had been disappointed with the outcome of a movement for the introduction at the Temple Church of collectors and sidesmen "to undertake the labour of observing men's slackness in divine duties"; and the language used, in connexion with the circumstances, suggests that what had been intended was to provide the Temple with deacons and elders, after the manner of the "conclusions" which have been described above, and which Travers had borne part in drafting.

It was said that the consideration of this plan of campaign would show the environment of a somewhat remarkable document. This document is the Confession of Faith which was signed by the Puritans in their private assemblies; and it deserves careful consideration. In regard to the frequency of references to it, the influence it exercised, and the history through which it passed, it is worthy to rank with the Admonitions and the Explicatio; it has even been called "the Palladium of English Presbyterianism"; and it will fairly complete the presentation of the Puritan platform<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's Works, vol. iii. pp. 571, 572, ed. 1888.

<sup>2</sup> So far as the present writer is aware, the Latin original of the document has never been published in any form, and Professor C. A. Briggs, whose knowledge of Puritan literature is very great, wrote in 1885, "The original edition in Latin

"seems to have entirely disappeared. . . . It was diligently searched for by the prelates, and wherever it was found it was destroyed." American Presbyterianism, App. p. i. Similarly P. L., the editor of the Directory, in a facsimile reprint of the 1644 edition published in 1872, writes, "the only shape in which the work is now

In the library at Lambeth Palace<sup>1</sup> and in the British Museum<sup>2</sup> there are two MSS., substantially identical, varying only in some unimportant points, bearing the title *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra ex Dei Verbo descripta*<sup>3</sup>. The MS. at Lambeth seems to have been the more carefully written of the two, and it is in a far earlier handwriting: it is bound up with several other MSS. of the sixteenth or seventeenth century: and in the list written by Archbishop Sancroft<sup>4</sup> at the beginning of the volume it is described as "*Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra, Dei Verbo descripta; Reginæ et Parlamento (ut fatentur) offerenda; cui etiam servandæ se post finem libri obligant.*" The British Museum MS. was copied by Thomas Baker, "*Ex MS. M<sup>ri</sup> Laughton, Coll. Trin. Sacellani*"<sup>5</sup>. Now these Latin MSS. correspond very closely<sup>6</sup> with the English book or pamphlet published in 1644, under the following title: "A Directory of Church-Government. Anciently contended for, and as farre as the Times would suffer, practised by the first Non-conformists in the daies of Queen Elizabeth. Found in the study of the Most accomplished Divine, Mr. Thomas Cartwright, after his decease; and reserved to be published for such a time as this. Published by authority"<sup>7</sup>. This Directory of Church Government may be regarded as virtually an English version of the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*, preserved in the two MSS. above mentioned; for the most part it is simply a translation of the *Disciplina*; and though in parts there are variations

"known to exist is this translation." In view of these statements, and believing that this important document has never hitherto been published in its original language, the present writer has, by permission of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, printed it as App. III to this volume.

<sup>1</sup> Codd. MSS. cxiii. No. 10, p. 180.

<sup>2</sup> Harl. 7029.

<sup>3</sup> The Lambeth copy omits *ex*.

<sup>4</sup> For this information the writer is indebted to the kindness of Mr. Kershaw, the librarian of the Lambeth Palace Library.

<sup>5</sup> The Mr. Laughton here mentioned was John Laughton, Chaplain of Trinity College, 1678-79, Librarian, 1679-83, Chaplain, 1683-1712, and

University Librarian, 1686-1712. He was a great book collector: and rendered important aid to Strype. His MSS. and papers were sold at his death. Cf. Biographical Notes on the Librarians of Trinity College, by the Rev. Dr. Sinker, to whom the present writer is indebted for this note.

<sup>6</sup> As is noticed by Thomas Baker in regard to the latter of the two.

<sup>7</sup> This important book was reprinted as Appendix iv in Neal's History of the Puritans; again in 1872, by the Synod of the Presbyterian Church in England; and also in 1885 by Professor C. A. Briggs in the appendix to his work on American Presbyterianism (T. & T. Clark).

of considerable extent (e.g. the omission of clauses, the different arrangement of sentences in a chapter<sup>1</sup>, the suppression of details, so that in one case<sup>2</sup> four lines of English stand for ten of Latin), there is no divergence of any real importance<sup>3</sup>. Substantially the two works coincide, and the Directory of 1644 may be taken as the English edition of the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra* which was in Cartwright's possession at the time of his death.

But it is possible to fix somewhat more closely the date and origin of the Latin work. In 1593 Bancroft published his *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings*, and his *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, and in very many passages he refers to that which he calls "*Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*," or "the New Draught of Discipline," or "Cart. &c., *newe discipline*," or "the New Booke of our English Discipline," or "the newly-subscribed booke of discipline." Now in several of these passages his citation is made in Latin<sup>4</sup>, and in every case the words correspond exactly with the MSS. at Lambeth and at the British Museum<sup>5</sup>. It is thus fairly certain that these MSS. represent that form of the Book of Discipline which had come into Bancroft's hands. Further, it is perhaps worth noticing (1) that Bancroft's quotations do not *so exactly* match with the corresponding passages in the English Directory of Church-Government, printed from the paper found in Cartwright's study<sup>6</sup>; and (2) that the Latin MSS. do not *so exactly* correspond with the references to the *Disciplina Sacra et Synodica* made in a document dated February 3, 1590<sup>7</sup>, and in Sutcliffe's *Treatise of Ecclesiasticall Discipline*<sup>8</sup>, published in 1590. For these

<sup>1</sup> As in the chapters Of the Communion, and Of Signifying their Names that are to Communicate, where the difference of arrangement is accompanied by some difference of language also.

<sup>2</sup> In the chapter Of the Assemblies of the Church, concerning the moderator.

<sup>3</sup> The differences are indeed not more, but less, than one would expect to find in two editions of a book which was (as this is known to have been) undergoing constant consideration

and revision.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. pp. 153, 209, 231, 305, of the *Survey*.

<sup>5</sup> Save for one trivial omission of a word in the latter.

<sup>6</sup> Certain clauses, not of any great importance, are found in one case, omitted in the other.

<sup>7</sup> v. Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, App. to bk. iv. No. iii; cf. also No. iv for further passages bearing on the Book of Discipline.

<sup>8</sup> v. The Epistle to the Reader, *ad fin.* In 1590 there is reference to the

variations clearly illustrate and confirm the account which Bancroft gives, in his book on *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings*<sup>1</sup>, of the modifications by which the Book of Discipline reached its ultimate form. In one passage<sup>2</sup> Bancroft gives a brief quotation from the acts of the assembly of the Warwickshire classes on the tenth day of the fourth month in 1588, affirming the Book of Discipline to be "a draught of Discipline, "essentiall and necessarie for all times." This phrase is found verbatim in the English form of acknowledgement or confession appended to the Lambeth MS., which form (with but two or three trivial deviations from the MS.) is subsequently given by Bancroft at full length; the phrase is *not* found verbatim in the Directory printed in 1644. Thus there may be some reason for thinking that the Lambeth MS. represents the form in which the Book of Discipline, the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*, stood in 1588: that it was (as has been said) this form that Bancroft had before him: and that the Directory, printed from the copy found in Cartwright's study, gives the *Disciplina* as it came to be after a later revision; when "at Sturbridge Fayre-time, the "next yeare (after the sayd Classicall Counsell of the Warwicke-shire brethren) vz. in the year 1589, there was another Synode "or generall meeting, helde in Saint John's Colledge in Cambridge. "'When' (saith M. Barbor) 'they did correct, alter, and amend "'divers imperfections conteined in the booke, called *Disciplina* "'*Ecclesiæ Sacra*, Verbo Dei descripta; and ' (as Maister Stone "affirmeth) 'did not onely perfect the saide forme of Discipline, "'but also did then and there, (as he remembereth,) voluntarily "'agree amongst themselves, that so many as would should "'subscribe to the saide booke of Discipline after that time<sup>3</sup>.'" Cartwright's name appears in the list of those present at this synod, and it seems not unlikely that it was after these proceedings that the Book of Discipline, having now taken its final form, was translated into English, according to a wish

Puritan advocacy of an Order of Widows; in the Latin MSS. there is no mention of any such order, nor is there apparently in the account of Cartwright's trial, or in the book found in his study.

<sup>1</sup> Bk. iii. ch. 3-7. In this work he

speaks of "the forme of Discipline" as "lately come to light."

<sup>2</sup> Bk. iii. ch. 6; cf. also ch. 11 and ch. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Bancroft, *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings*, bk. iii. ch. 7.

expressed at a meeting held in the September of 1587<sup>1</sup>; and so found after Cartwright's death and printed in 1644.

The original Latin will be followed in the account of the *Disciplina* now to be given.

The first paragraph of the document enunciates the first principle of the Discipline. "*Disciplina Ecclesiæ Christianæ, in omne tempus necessaria, a Christo tradita est, et Sacris Scripturis consignatur: Itaque vera et legitima ex eis iisque solis petenda est. Quæ vero alio fundamento nititur, illegitima et adulterina haberi debet.*"

The equality and independence of all particular Churches is then declared: "*Nulla sibi potestatem in alias, ac ne jus quidem ullum, quod non aliis æque conveniat, vendicare potest.*"

All the ministers of the several Churches, "*pro diversâ generum suorum ratione, potestate inter se sunt æquales.*" Ministers are to be called, tried, and elected to their charge, and then ordained to it, "*publicis ejus ecclesiæ precibus.*" The ministers of the Church are first the ministers of the Word, whether pastors or doctors, then elders, "*qui singulorum vitæ et moribus invigilent,*" and deacons, "*qui pauperum curam agant.*"

There is to be a presbytery in every church, consisting of the ministers of the Word and of the elders, entrusted with the guidance of the church's affairs, and with the exercise of discipline over all its members, by admonition, suspension, and excommunication. "*In omnibus autem majoribus ecclesiæ negotiis, ut quibuscunque excommunicandis, et administris ecclesiæ eligendis, vel abdicandis, nihil inscia vel invita ecclesia decerni debet.*"

Provision is then made for the conference of representatives from the several Churches, and it is laid down that, though no one Church has any right or power over another, "*tamen plurium sententiæ Verbo Dei consentaneæ singulares omnes ejus consilii et conventus ecclesiæ parere debent.*"

The second part of the document contains what is called the Synodical Discipline, "*ex ecclesiarum (quæ eam ex Dei Verbo*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A short document, bearing date Sept. 8, 1587, which follows the copy of the *Disciplina Ecclesiæ* Sacra, in the British Museum MS.

(Harl. 7029), and which is given in the App. to vol. iii of Strype's *Annals*: App. to Bk. ii. No. xxxiv.

"instaurarunt) usu, Synodis atque libris de eadem re scriptis  
"collecta, et ad certa quædam capita relata."

This begins with provisions relating to the calling and electing of ministers. A man is not to seek for any office in the Church, but to wait till he is called; when he is called it must be, not to an undefined ministry, but to a particular church; and no one is to be called "nisi qui confessioni doctrinæ et disciplinæ sub-  
"scripserit; quarum admoneantur exempla apud se habere."

Then follow directions with regard to the order of the service before and after the sermon, with regard to the substance, style, and delivery of the sermon, and to the teaching of two catechisms: and then this clause: "Reliqua Liturgiæ tota ratio in Sacra-  
"mentorū administratione et ex usu ecclesiæ in Nuptiarum  
"benedictione consistit. Cujus forma commodissima est, quæ ab  
"ecclesiis usurpatur, quæ disciplinam ex Dei Verbo instaura-  
"runt<sup>1</sup>. . . . Ad Cœnam admittantur tantum ii qui confessionem  
"doctrinæ ediderunt, et se disciplinæ subjecerint: nisi qui litteras  
"testimoniales idoneas aliunde attulerint, vel alio idoneo testi-  
"monio se comprobarunt." The elders are to know every particular house and member of the church, that they may inform the minister of the condition of every one; but "Ad  
"Consistorium nemo deferatur, nisi ante relato nomine<sup>2</sup> videatur  
"ita faciendum, ex Consistorii judicio." Full directions are given for the proceedings of the Consistory in matters of discipline. The act of Excommunication is to be approached very deliberately. "Primo Dominico, nomen non edetur per-  
"sonæ; secundo edetur: tertio denuntiabitur; proximo excom-  
"municandum nisi quis idoneam causam ei sententiæ interdicendi  
"afferre possit, atque ita die quarto sententia feratur."

The rest of the document is taken up by a complete delineation of the system of conferences or councils. The smallest of these is a *classis*, which consists of the representatives (who must be either ministers or elders) of a small number of churches in the same neighbourhood, e.g. twelve, meeting frequently. Next comes a synod, a meeting of representatives from several *classes*:

<sup>1</sup> Concerning the Puritan Form of Common Prayer offered to the House of Commons in 1584, and its distinction from the Book of Dis-

cipline, cf. Appendix IV.

<sup>2</sup> It seems that *celato nomine* would yield better meaning; and this is the reading of the British Museum MS.

and a synod may be either provincial, national, or œcumenical. Rules are laid down concerning the constitution, summoning, and procedure of these bodies.

The document ends with the following passage :—

“Hæc Disciplina (cujus titulus inscribitur, Disciplina Ecclesiæ Dei  
“Verbo descripta) quantum judicare licet, ex ipsius Sacræ Scripturæ  
“purissimis fontibus hausta atque petita est : et Disciplinam Ecclesiæ  
“necessariam οὐσιώδη et omnium temporum communem comprehendit.

“Synodica vëro, quæ subjungitur, quatenus iisdem fundamentis  
“nititur, necessaria item et æterna est : quatenus vero non diserte  
“Sacræ Scripturæ autoritate confirmatur, sed ad Ecclesiæ usum et  
“tempora, pro eorum varietate, ex ejusdem Scripturæ analogiâ, et  
“communibus præceptis accommodatur, ecclesiis quæ eam amplec-  
“tuntur, utilis censenda est. Sed in ejusmodi, quæ ad essentiam  
“Disciplinæ non spectant, pro diversâ ecclesiarum conditione, ex æque  
“piâ ratione et verbo Dei innixâ mutari potest.”

The MS. of this document in the British Museum is followed by two pages containing, apparently, the notes of a “conventus” (larger than a *classis*) held September 8, 1587. They are very interesting as showing the character of the questions discussed at such a meeting, and the provisions for the secrecy and extension of the organization<sup>1</sup>. But a more important paper is attached to the MS. in the Lambeth library. It seems to be a form of subscription or approval, similar to, though considerably longer than, that which is appended to the English edition of the Sacred Discipline published in 1644.

It runs as follows :—

“The brethren assembled together in the Name of God having heard  
“and examined by the Word of God according to their best ability and  
“judgement in it a draught of discipline essentiall and necessary for  
“all times, and Sinodically, gathered out of the Sinods, and use of the  
“Churches, have thought good to testify concerning it as followeth.

“We acknowledge and confesse the same agreeable to God’s most  
“holie worde so farre as we are able to judge or discern of it, excepting  
“some few points, which we have sent to our Reverend brethren of  
“this assembly for their further resolution.

“We affirm it to be the same which we desire to be established in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Appendix to the 3rd volume of Strype’s Annals, where these notes are given. App. to Bk. ii. No. xxxiv.

"this Church, by daily prayer to God: which we promise (as God shall offer opportunity, and give us to discern it so expedient) by humble suite unto her Majesty's honourable Council and the parliament, and by all other lawful and convenient meanes, to further and advance, so far as the laws and peace and the present estate of our Church will suffer it and not enforce to the contrary. We promise to guide ourselves and to be guided by it, and according to it.

"For more especial declaration of some points more important and necessary we promise uniformity, to follow such order when we preach the Word of God as in the book by us is set down in the Chapters of the Office of Ministers of the Word, of preaching or sermons, of Sacraments, of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

"Further also we promise to follow the order set down in the Chapters of the meetings as far as it concerneth the Ministers of the Worde. For which purpose we promise to meet every six weeks together in classical conference with such of the brethren here assembled as for their neighbourhood may fit us best: and such other as by their advise we shall be desired to join with us.

"The like we promise for provincial meetings every half year from our Conference to send unto them, as is set down in the Chapter concerning the provinces and the Conference belonging unto them, being divided according to the order following.

"Likewise also that we will attend the general assembly every year and at all parliaments, and as often as by order it shall be thought good to be assembled<sup>1</sup>."

Such were the principles, purposes, and methods of the Puritans who, at the time when Hooker entered the field of controversy and was writing his great book, were working to bring the Church of England into conformity with themselves without separating themselves from it<sup>2</sup>. The plan which has been here shown was definite and systematic, and the range over which it was being pursued is indicated by the fact that "above 500, all beneficed in the Church of England," "subscribed or declared their approbation of the Book of Discipline"; though this number seems to give a very inadequate idea of the actual extent of the movement among the beneficed clergy<sup>3</sup>. And

<sup>1</sup> A form of assent almost exactly identical with this is given by P. L. in the Preface to the 1872 edition of the Directory.

<sup>2</sup> For further illustration of the

plan pursued cf. Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, Bk. III. ch. xxi; Bk. IV. ch. i. & vi.

<sup>3</sup> Neal, i. 423, and note.

meanwhile a less formal but perhaps not less effective propagation of the cause was going on all over England, among those who saw the discreditable blemishes and abuses of the existing state of things, who knew the imminent peril of papal aggression, and who welcomed sincerely, if hastily, the promise of a discipline which should make clergymen do their duty, and clear the Church of scandals, and erect, far away from all that was touched with the associations of the unreformed Church, a strong and plain and defiant barrier against the dreaded enemy of English liberty. Hooker, in the third chapter of his Preface, lets his humour have some play, within the bounds of charity, in describing "by what means so many of the people are trained "unto the liking of that discipline," and the especial labour that "hath been bestowed to win and retain towards this cause "them whose judgements are commonly weakest by reason of "their sex," and who showed themselves especially apt "to "serve as instruments and helps in the cause. Apter they are," he says, "through the eagerness of their affection, that maketh "them, which way soever they take, diligent in drawing their "husbands, children, servants, friends and allies the same way; "apter through that natural inclination unto pity, which breedeth "in them a greater readiness than in men to be bountiful "towards their preachers who suffer want; apter through sundry "opportunities, which they especially have, to procure encourage- "ments for their brethren; finally, apter through a singular "delight which they take in giving very large and particular "intelligence, how all near about them stand affected as con- "cerning the same cause<sup>1</sup>." Nor can the movement have failed to draw strength from the hardships and sufferings which many were willing to face for its sake; that stamp of failure which is on the policy of persecution<sup>2</sup> is to be traced in the disadvantage and precariousness which every approach to it involves; and the severity used against the Puritans was exposed to the more contempt and hatred because some of those who wielded it had themselves approved and followed the very ways they now prohibited. Several members of the Privy Council, with motives as diverse as those likely to actuate Burghley on the one hand and Leicester

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's Works, vol. i. pp. 143, 152, 153.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement*, ch. ix, *ad fin.*

on the other<sup>1</sup>, showed some favour to the movement, or at least opposed the measures taken to repress it; while others probably were preoccupied with that cloud of fear which hung over men's minds until the great relief came with the defeat of the Armada in 1588. But nothing, surely, can have contributed so much to the opportunities, the power, the zeal, the hopes of Puritans as did the neglect of duty in the Church. At such a time ignorance and inability among the clergy were serious enough, but avarice and plain indifference to the meaning of a spiritual charge were far worse; and it would have been strange if any man who was wholly possessed with the truth of his message and really bent on winning souls to God had failed to carry all before him in a parish whose minister could only struggle through the service, never preached, but read, perhaps four purchased sermons in the course of the year, or, it may be, had never resided in the place at all, and, had he done so, might only have made matters worse by the example of his vicious life. These were the causes which gave the Puritan appeal a strength that even the ribald violence of some among its supporters could not countervail; these were the causes which were storing more and more force behind the agitation, and behind the petitions which from time to time were made to the Queen, the Privy Council, and the Parliament—petitions which were sure to find sympathy and support in the last-named body. It should be realized and remembered that the attack against which Hooker had to defend the Church was no desultory firing of criticisms at an impregnable position, no unpromising and baseless project of impossible reforms, no clamour sure to pass away when its first vehemence had abated, and men could see how things really stood; it was the determined and confident and increasing pressure of a system which had effected at Geneva one of the most remarkable achievements in that eventful age; and it was directed against a position imperfectly understood, timorously maintained, compromised by wrong methods of defence, and betrayed by many whom there was not strength to punish or eject. What the Puritans intended has been shown; how near they seemed to success may be gathered from the sound of grave foreboding in the words with which Hooker—no distrustful

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hooker, Dedication of Bk. V, § 8, with Keble's note.

or faint-hearted champion for the truth's sake--begins his work :  
"Though for no other cause, yet for this ; that posterity may  
"know we have not loosely through silence permitted things to  
"pass away as in a dream, there shall be for men's information  
"extant thus much concerning the present state of the Church  
"of God established amongst us, and their careful endeavour  
"which would have upheld the same<sup>1</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's Works, vol. i. p. 125.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *The Life of Hooker.*

IT was as Master of the Temple, with Walter Travers holding the office of Reader, that Hooker found himself brought into prominence among those who were upholding the established order of the Church of England against the Puritan movement<sup>1</sup>. It was a curious coincidence of events that had led to his coming out of a remote little parish in Buckinghamshire to a conspicuous and important post in London; but his temperament and training were no ill equipment for the dangers of both publicity and controversy. For (as has been said before) he sincerely disliked both. He was a patient, thorough student, and he had had good opportunities of study, under conditions which had taught him to respect those from whom he differed. The singular promise of his early boyhood had won him friends whose generosity enabled him first to stay on at Exeter High School<sup>2</sup>, when his parents, Roger and Joan Hooker, were minded to make him an apprentice; and then, in 1568, when he was about fifteen, to go up to Corpus Christi College at Oxford. Those who so helped him must be named with honour: they were his school-master<sup>3</sup>; his uncle, John Hooker, Chamberlain of Exeter; Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury; Dr. Cole, President of Corpus Christi College; and Robert Nowell, a great lawyer in London, who had the happiness of also helping Edmund Spenser, and Lancelot Andrewes<sup>4</sup>. He probably matriculated at Corpus as a Chorister,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Walton's *Life of Hooker*; Hooker's Works, vol. i. p. 32; though perhaps Walton somewhat overstates Hooker's previous exemption from the controversy.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. H. Newport, *Exeter Grammar School*, p. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Probably, Mr. Williams; cf. H.

Newport, *Exeter Grammar School*, p. 5; Hooker, vol. i. p. 8, note.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *The Spending of the Money of Robert Nowell*: edited by Dr. Grosart from one of the Towneley Hall MSS., and cited by Dr. Fowler, *History of Corpus Christi College*, where the difficult points in regard

and was afterwards promoted to be a clerk or "*Minister Sacelli*"; he was admitted *Discipulus* (or Scholar) on Christmas Eve, 1573, under conditions which seem to show that his ability and industry were such as to warrant a rare departure from ordinary procedure; he was admitted B.A. on the 14th of the following January. In 1577 he was admitted M.A., and elected a Probationary Fellow (*Scholaris*) at his College<sup>1</sup>. In 1579 he was, under the authority of a letter from the Chancellor, appointed to act as deputy for the Regius Professor of Hebrew, for whom he lectured during the remainder of his years at Oxford.

Early in his University days, about 1571, soon after the death of Bishop Jewel had made him doubtful whether he could stay at Oxford, he had been entrusted with the care of two boys, Edwin Sandys, a son of the Bishop of London, and George Cranmer, a great nephew of the Archbishop. The trust had been suggested by a conversation between Bishop Jewel and Bishop Sandys, and it relieved Hooker of anxiety about the little money that he needed. But it did more than this. It led to a strong and lasting friendship between Hooker and the two lads, a friendship which when they were young men told with singular effect on the course of their tutor's life and work.

The date of Hooker's ordination is not known. But it was, according to Walton, in or about the year 1581 that he was appointed, probably by Aylmer, Bishop of London, to preach at St. Paul's Cross. His teaching on that occasion was challenged as unsound. He drew in his sermon a distinction between the antecedent will of God, that all mankind should be saved, and the consequent will of God, "that those only should be saved "that did live answerable to that degree of grace which He "had offered or afforded them." Exception was taken to this teaching because it "seemed to cross a late opinion of Mr. Calvin's," and the incident is interesting as showing that already Hooker's mind was freeing itself from the Calvinist teaching of his excellent and well-known tutor at Corpus Christi College, Dr. John Rainolds<sup>2</sup>.

to Hooker's career at the College receive full and clear treatment, pp. 147-153. Cf. p. 138.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hooker, Book I, ed. R. W. Church, p. xxvii, note; and Dr.

Fowler's History of C. C. C., p. 148.

<sup>2</sup> For a delightful account of Dr. Rainolds, cf. Dr. Fowler, *ibid.*, pp. 157-168, and pp. 137, 142.

The same teaching reappears, some thirteen or fourteen years later, as a main theme of contention in a very great and eventful controversy at Cambridge<sup>1</sup>. And in 1597<sup>2</sup>, and in 1599<sup>3</sup>, the year before he died, the position was carefully developed and reaffirmed by Hooker as expressing his mature belief. He was able, it appears, to deal with those who assailed him for it after his sermon at St. Paul's Cross, and he could plead that the Bishop of London, who heard what he said, found no fault with it<sup>4</sup>.

But the visit to London is said to have resulted in the more lasting trouble of Hooker's unhappy marriage. It is a well-known story, how Mrs. Churchman, to whose house he came, "wet, weary, and weather-beaten," to lodge there for two days before and one day after his sermon, took good care of him, and cured him of his cold and faintness; and how she afterwards availed herself of his grateful docility to persuade him "that he was a man of a tender constitution," and "that it was best for him to have a wife that might prove a nurse to him; such an one as might both prolong his life, and make it more comfortable; and such an one she could and would provide, if he thought fit to marry." He yielded, Walton says, to this persuasion, and trusted Mrs. Churchman with the responsibility of choosing his wife; a trust which she discharged by choosing for him her own daughter Joan. The story is quaint enough; but the late Dean of St. Paul's (in his brilliant introduction to the First Book of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity) shows good reasons for doubting whether it is true. There seems little doubt that Hooker's wife was not wisely chosen; but Walton's account of the choice, as the Dean says, "exalts Hooker's simplicity at the expense of his good sense and good feeling in a way which provokes suspicion." "It is not consistent with what Hooker discloses of his own character in his writings, which, as Mr. Keble has remarked, show, as far as writings can show, not only abundant shrewdness of observation, but much sensitiveness and quickness of temper, and are further marked throughout by humour and very keen irony. Hooker, at any rate, is not

<sup>1</sup> Strype, Life of Whitgift, Bk. IV. ch. 18, and App. No. xxix.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Hooker, Bk. V. ch. xlix.

<sup>3</sup> Id. App. i. to Bk. V, and *infra*, pp. 147, 215-217.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hooker's Answer to Travers. §8.

"likely himself to have told the story. It is much more like the "guess of pitying or indignant friends<sup>1</sup> who disliked his wife. "The marriage was probably a mistaken and ill-assorted one. "But we do not want an excess of coarse scheming in a mother-in-law, and of credulous simplicity in a son-in-law, to account "for all the mistakes in marriage of great and wise men<sup>2</sup>."

His marriage necessarily involved the close of his college life, and in 1584 he was appointed to the rectory of Drayton Beauchamp, near to Aylesbury and to Tring, and included, at that time, in the diocese of Lincoln. There his former pupils, Edwin Sandys and George Cranmer, quickly came to visit him, and found him in a home that must have looked comfortable and picturesque enough, standing among its trees close by the church, with high-pitched roofs and gable-ends and tall chimney-stacks—a typical country parsonage. But, it seems, the young men found their welcome as cold as Mrs. Hooker could make it; and the house seemed cheerless, and their old tutor out of his element, and needing all his great patience to put a good face on things. And so they took their leave; and Edwin Sandys, when he reached London, impressed on his father, now Archbishop of York, the unhappy lot of one whom they had learnt by long experience to trust and honour.

When events are recalled across a long interval the more striking and curious phases in their sequence are apt to gain undue prominence. And so somewhat less than Walton implies may have turned on the coincidence that, soon after Edwin Sandys brought to his father the news of Hooker's comfortless home, the Archbishop was dining at the Temple and found every one talking about the Mastership, which Richard Alvey's death had made void. But Jewel's assurance and his own experience of Hooker's trustworthiness may well have led the Archbishop to make the most of such a chance, and the circumstances were such as to give special opportuneness to his commendation of his son's tutor for the vacant place. Alvey had been Master of the Temple for a quarter of

<sup>1</sup> The story may perhaps have lost nothing by the experience and reports of William Cranmer and his sisters. Cf. Introduction to Walton's Life of

Hooker: Hooker, vol. i. p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> R. W. Church, Introduction to Hooker, Bk. I. pp. viii, ix.

a century. He was among those who came nearest to the Puritans in sympathy and opinions, and there were many at the Temple who agreed with him; he had so borne himself in his office as to deserve and win men's affectionate reverence; and on his death-bed he had expressed the hope that Walter Travers, already Reader or afternoon preacher, might be chosen by the Queen to succeed him in the Mastership. The hope was shared by many of the society, and by Burghley, the Lord Treasurer. But there were also many who had no wish to see Travers Master, and his appointment was earnestly deprecated by Whitgift, who had lately become Archbishop of Canterbury, and who had weight with the Queen. He could point back to the bygone difficulties with Travers at Cambridge, to the fact that he was "either in no degree of the ministry at all or else "ordered beyond the seas," to his prominence and activity among the Puritans, and to his authorship of the *Explicatio*. The Mastership was an office of wide influence, direct and indirect, and the Archbishop might reasonably think that it would be a significant and an unsettling act for the Queen to appoint to it "a depraver of the present state and government." To the Queen, therefore, and to Burghley he wrote strenuously against Travers' appointment. He was anxious that Dr. Bond, one of the Queen's chaplains, should be appointed. But Burghley, while he speaks well of Bond as learned and honest, and places him next after Travers for the post, seems to imply that the appointment would be unwelcome at the Temple; and perhaps the probability that he would have uphill work there entered into the Queen's feeling that his health would not stand the strain.

So things stood when Hooker's name was brought to the front and found favour—the Queen, it may be, not wishing to show preference between Burghley and Whitgift—and on March 17, 1584, Hooker became Master of the Temple. He accepted the office with reluctance; probably his country parish, notwithstanding the drawbacks which had impressed Edwin Sandys, was more congenial to him than a conspicuous place in London, and doubtless he foresaw something of the conflict that was before him. It was almost inconceivable that things should go smoothly if he and Travers were to be yoked together; for the difference between

them was such as all the goodness and sincerity on both sides could not keep from stirring conflict when the two men were brought into close and constant contact. The first stage in their disagreement has already been described<sup>1</sup>; the difficulties began before the work; and though Hooker held his own in the negotiations on the eve of his first Sunday at the Temple, it is easy to imagine that that early beginning of divergence from his colleague was such an earnest of trouble as might make one "blessed with so blessed a bashfulness that in his younger days "his pupils might easily look him out of countenance"<sup>2</sup>, wish that he were back in the peace and poverty of Drayton Beauchamp. And very soon the trouble was palpable and acute. For when Hooker, as Master, was preaching every Sunday morning, and Travers, as Reader, every Sunday afternoon, the Reader naturally saw unsoundness in the Master's sermons and naturally thought it necessary to correct them by his own; so that, in Fuller's well-known phrase, "the pulpit spake pure Canterbury in the morning, "and Geneva in the afternoon." The disputing, in that age of general alertness for controversial theology, was closely watched by the congregation, and "the gravest Benchers," writes Fuller, "were not more exact in taking instructions from their clients "than in writing notes from the mouths of their Ministers." The unedifying interest seems to have been kept up for about a year: it closed with a Sunday of surprise and disappointment. For at the afternoon service, when—to quote Fuller once more—"the "cloth (as I may say) and napkins were laid, yea, the guests set, "and their knives drawn for their spiritual repast," Travers was served with a notice from the Archbishop of Canterbury, forbidding him to preach any more. "His auditory," says Fuller, "sent sermonless home, manifested, in their variety of passion, "some grieving, some frowning, some murmuring, and the wisest "sort, who held their tongues, shook their heads as disliking the "managing of the matter"<sup>3</sup>.—And so the long debate in the Temple Church was closed; but closed in a way that did not augur well for peace and contentment there or elsewhere. Whitgift's intervention does not by any extant evidence appear to have

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *supra*, pp. 67, 68; and contrast the case of Mr. Hocknell, described in Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, Bk. IV. ch. i.

<sup>2</sup> Walton's *Life of Hooker*, p. 78. Cf. Fowler, *History of Corpus Christi College*, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup> Fuller, *Church History*, ix. 217.

been suggested in any way by Hooker; it may perhaps have been instigated by the Queen; but whatever prompted it, and however it may be defended, it was unfortunate that by an act which seemed at least high-handed and discourteous, the Archbishop's champion was left in the possession of the field where many critical eyes had been watching how the fight would go.

The Archbishop's inhibition rested on three grounds: that Travers was not lawfully called to the function of the ministry; that he preached without license; and that he had violated an order in the Advertisements of 1566, which required that erroneous doctrine, "if it came to be publicly taught, should not be publicly refuted, but that notice should be given to the Ordinary, to hear and determine such causes, to prevent public disturbance." Travers had something to say on all three points<sup>1</sup>: something adequate, it appears, on the second; it was not likely that he would submit to the Archbishop's action without appeal or protest; and he had many friends both in Parliament and in the Privy Council to secure a fair hearing for his arguments. Accordingly he wrote a long Supplication to the Council, begging them to interpose for the recall of Whitgift's inhibition. It seems that this Supplication was not printed until 1612; but it was without delay copied out and circulated in manuscript. Hooker was therefore forced to make some public answer, since the third of the charges against Travers and the greater part of Travers' Supplication concerned their personal and public relation as Master and Reader at the Temple. His Answer to the

<sup>1</sup> The last of these three grounds gives occasion to a great deal of the discussion contained in Travers' Supplication and Hooker's Answer: but there seems little room for doubt that Travers had in this regard offended against the Advertisements, whatever provocation he might, or might not, be able to adduce in extenuation of the offence: indeed he comes near admitting this when he says, "I had resolved . . . that I would no more answer in that place any objections to the doctrine taught by any means, but some other way satisfy such as should require it": since he thus fairly warrants Hooker's retort, "He is blamed because the

"thing he had done was amiss, and his answer is, That which I would have done afterward had been well, if so be I had done it."—On the second of the three grounds Travers' answer seems to be clear and strong; "My allowance was from the Bishop of London, testified by his two several letters to the Inner Temple."—The first ground touches a question too complex to be adequately treated here. It is dealt with admirably in Dr. Bright's *Roman See in the Early Church*, pp. 466–471. Cf. *Strype's Life of Whitgift*, Bk. III. ch. xvi. and App. No. xxx; a document of great importance.

Supplication was put into the form of a letter to the Archbishop; and this also was printed in 1612, while Travers was still living.

There was in the Council no lack of sympathy with the Puritan movement. But whether because Travers' case was weak, or because Whitgift's will was strong, or because the Queen was decisive, no action was taken. The inhibition was left in force, and Travers seems to have remained for a while in the background. In 1594 he became Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, "*a colonia deducta* from Cambridge, and particularly from Trinity College "therein." But he did not stay long in Ireland: "discomposed "with the fear of their civil wars, he returned into England," and spent the last years of a long life in silence and obscurity. It is pleasant to note that, keen as the controversy had been, he did justice to Hooker's character as Hooker did to his<sup>1</sup>.

But though Travers was silenced, the Temple was not at peace. Burghley had warned Dr. Bond, when the Mastership was vacant in 1584, that "if he came not to the place with some applause of "the company, he shall be weary thereof<sup>2</sup>"; and all that he had anticipated from the activity of criticism and the power of translating disapproval into annoyance was likely to be surpassed in Hooker's experience after Whitgift's intervention. Walton says that "the chief Benchers gave him much reverence and encouragement"; but there was likely to be an irreconcilable section among those who had held with Travers, and others of them might look coldly at Hooker and make him feel uncomfortably enough that they disliked his teaching and wished that Travers was in his place. Certainly it had come to be a very unhappy place, and he was "weary of the noise and oppositions of it," even while they were a part of the force that was urging him on towards his great and lasting work.

For it was his experience of controversy at the Temple that led Hooker to write his treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. In Walton's Life, and in a letter of Hooker's which he quotes, there is a full account of the origin of the book: and it was no unworthy origin. To Hooker's mind, just and humble, appreciating fully the learning and goodness of his opponent, it

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fuller, bk. ix. 217, 218. Mullinger, the University of Cambridge, ii. 353, 355; Walton's Life

of Hooker, in Keble's Hooker, p. 67, and note.

<sup>2</sup> Walton's Life of Hooker, p. 30.

was a disquieting or at least a puzzling thing to find that what he himself believed, revered, and loved was judged by Travers to be corrupt and wrong. It was an experience that came to him as a challenge; not shaking his belief, but setting him a task; sending him back to scrutinize with fresh severity and detail the foundations of his belief; to see exactly why he was sure and where his opponent might have missed the way; somewhat as a mathematician may retrace, even more minutely than he himself may need, every step in a long process, not in doubt of his own result, but in deference to another's difficulty, and looking out for the point which that other may have missed. So Hooker read and thought laboriously, examining his own mind and conscience, and the writings of other men, and the Bible, hoping that he might not merely satisfy himself afresh and leave himself no room or corner for a doubt to rise out of, but also that he might commend to others' conscience what was thus clear to his own, and free them from all scruples about obedience to those laws which seemed to him so certainly authoritative. That was the task that Travers' opposition set him. And then there came the repugnance of Travers' friends and followers at the Temple among those to whom his office bound him to commend the truth by all ways in his power. He was not, and probably he knew that he was not, effective as a preacher. But he had the knowledge and the power of work and the subtlety and penetration and patience of thought which should avail to make a strong case clear to able men; he had a deep enthusiasm for the Church's cause; he had that amplitude of view which braces men for intellectual enterprise on a large scale, and stirs them to a natural eloquence, almost as great scenery or great events excite the faculty of poets; and whether he was aware or unaware of his singular gifts, their presence told on his conception of the work he had to do. And so, as he toiled on, painstaking, unremitting, resolute—labouring, in his own phrase, even to anatomize every particle of that body which he was to uphold sound<sup>1</sup>—he formed his brave design: to display the universal field of law; to show how by the will and providence of God the whole world and all the ways of men are included in that system, vast and manifold, whereby through diverse channels the authority and

<sup>1</sup> Preface to Bk. V. § 9.

beneficence of law travels to the diverse fields of human life; and then to claim for the legislative action of the Church its rightful place and its divine sanction within that sacred system which reaches from the throne of the Most High to the least of the creatures He has made.

The work was begun at the Temple, and it seems likely that the first four books were mainly written there<sup>1</sup>. But as Hooker went on he felt the incongruity between such thorough and sustained and dispassionate thinking as he was bent on and the daily fretting of contention and hostility: and he believed that his best service would be rendered in pursuing the former, not in struggling against the latter. Probably also the vast requirement of his task became clearer to him as he laboured at it; and it may be that he as well as others saw further and scanned an ampler field when the defeat of the Armada in 1588 had rolled away the over-clouding fear of Rome. The craving for quiet study grew upon him, and he begged the Archbishop to send him back from his conspicuous place in London to some country parsonage, where, he said, "I may study, and pray for God's blessing upon my endeavours, and keep myself in peace and privacy, and behold God's blessing spring out of my mother earth, and eat my own bread without oppositions." The petition was characteristic of Hooker, and Whitgift might well understand it, and measure fairly the relative importance of the work that Hooker was likely to do under the one set of conditions and under the other. And so in 1591 he presented Hooker to the rectory of Boscombe near Salisbury; and the brief spell of prominence, the uncongenial experience of the great world came to an end. At Boscombe Hooker finished his first four books, and, according to Walton, published them in 1594<sup>2</sup>; he was made subdean of Sarum, with the Prebend of Netheravon, neither preferment carrying much emolument. In 1595 the Queen presented him to the rectory of Bishopsbourne near Canterbury; and there he finished his Fifth Book, and published it in 1597. One sore trouble broke the calm tenor of his work—a vile slander on him, borne for many months, till his loyal friends Sandys and Cranmer

<sup>1</sup> They were entered at Stationers' Hall and submitted to Burghley in the year after Hooker left the

Temple.

<sup>2</sup> For some account of the editions of Books I–V, see App. V.

hunted out his slanderer. In the last year of his life he was making notes in preparation for a reply to the Christian Letter, the anonymous pamphlet called forth by the Fifth Book—notes which show that the force and keenness and vivacity of his mind had suffered no abatement. With the same purpose he wrote the fragment which has been printed as an appendix to the Fifth Book; and he was working hard at his great treatise when a chill brought on a sharp illness, from which he never recovered. Yet still he worked, praying only “to live to finish his three remaining “Books of Polity.” That prayer was granted him; yet “it is “thought he hastened his own death by hastening to give life to “his Books.” But finished they were before his laborious and unworldly course among men reached its close in the winter of the year 1600.

## CHAPTER IV.

### *The Preface to the Treatise, and the First Four Books.*

THE first four books were published, with the Preface for the whole work, three or four years before the Fifth Book, from which they differ both in scale and in character. The four together are only about half as long as the fifth, and they are concerned with the main principles of the Puritan position, and with the principles and conceptions which Hooker sets against them; whereas the fifth deals with particular allegations of the Puritans against the existing order and ceremonial of the Church. Thus the earlier books are easily separable from the later; but they are presupposed in it, and cannot be ignored if it is to be rightly studied and appreciated. They have indeed a preeminent importance for a due estimate of Hooker's work, for they show his power in its widest, boldest exercise; they are the achievement in which he rises into highest distinction above the level of controversy in his day. One can imagine a well-meaning Puritan being somewhat puzzled as he turned the pages, feeling that he was less familiar with the debate than he had thought: and the imagination is borne out by some of the criticisms which the work received. It is indeed a wonderful and impressive thing, and it may serve to show the courage that great learning and hard thinking give a man, to see how a quiet, humble student lifted at once into a more generous air the conflict in which he was called to bear his part.

What is now to be attempted is such a presentation of the general course and main points of this first part of the treatise as may help the student of the Fifth Book to realize the conceptions with which Hooker met the Puritan attack, the ground on which he stands, and the characteristic principles of his position.

I.

The vividness and power of certain parts in the long Preface have diverted attention from the purpose of the whole. That purpose is indeed inadequately shown; but with care it can be traced; and it is worth tracing.

Mention has already been made of the note of apprehension and foreboding which sounds in the first sentence of the Preface. The defence of the historic Church is felt to be an arduous enterprise, where much ground has been already lost. The pervading thought of the Preface is in harmony with this beginning. Hooker writes as one who is aware of a wide prejudice against the cause he is maintaining<sup>1</sup>. In various ways his opponents have secured a presumption in many minds that they must be right, and Hooker is concerned to dispel or attenuate this presumption, by examining the causes which have engendered it, and by showing that they really have no bearing on the question at issue, that however naturally they may have commended the Puritan position they have not done so logically, and that the truth or falsehood of that position ought to be ascertained by an independent and fearless and open-minded inquiry.

Such is the purpose and effort underlying and giving coherence to the whole Preface. Hooker frankly owns that he himself had thought there must be in the Puritan movement more reason than, when he scrutinized it, he was able to discover. The number and earnestness of the Puritans had lodged in his mind an unwarranted presumption that they must be more or less right<sup>2</sup>; and he knows that a similar presumption has been similarly lodged in the minds of many others. Many were tending to infer the rightfulness of the Holy Discipline from the wide deference, the commanding position which it had attained; and Hooker therefore sets himself to show that that position and deference had been secured by advantages and events which con-

<sup>1</sup> Hooker must have been thoroughly familiar with the great Preface to Calvin's Institutes, reckoned "as one" of the three most famous Prefaces "which the world has ever seen"; and there is a certain likeness between Calvin's anxiety to get a fair

hearing with Francis I and Hooker's anxiety to clear the ground for the cause which he had to maintain. Cf. Dyer, *Life of John Calvin*, p. 33. Espin, *Critical Essays*, p. 182.

<sup>2</sup> Preface, ch. i. § 2.

stituted no evidence of truth or right. In his brilliant sketch of Calvin's work at Geneva<sup>1</sup>, though he touches incidentally many other points of interest, this is his especial aim. He shows how the Discipline met a great need at a momentous crisis; how strong and able and masterly and indefatigable and uncompromising a man its founder was; how the growth of his fame in all parts and the course of events at Geneva tended to enhance his power and consolidate his work; how his commanding influence and his rightful authority as a teacher masked the lack of Scriptural warrant for the system he maintained; and how the range of its acceptance spread with the advance of his prestige. Thus it was that the Discipline had come to hold its impressive dignity and sway among men, and to be so enthroned that there seemed audacity in asking for its credentials. But in truth such asking was reasonable enough; for the causes which had thus exalted the Discipline involved no evidence of its Scriptural authority, its divine origin, its right to supremacy; and high as it stood, it might still be found ill-grounded and indefensible.

The question of its truth, then, should be investigated fearlessly. But here a second source of presumption against his own cause and in favour of the Puritans seems to occur to Hooker's mind. It is characteristic of him to think respectfully of human reason in all its exercises and manifestations; and it is no light matter to him to see that a great multitude of men in England profess themselves convinced that the Puritans are right. The Discipline has not only acquired that strong mastery at Geneva, and that wide influence through Europe of which Hooker has been giving an account; it has also secured the hearty approval of a vast number of English men and women. But two considerations check that approval from having the logical significance which might otherwise be claimed for it. The first is that the matter of the controversy is such as to require special training and knowledge for a right judgement, so that the opinion of the uninformed multitude of men has little weight in it. The second—which is treated more fully—is that the method followed in the convincing of this multitude is not such as to accredit their resulting conviction. Hooker's sketch of this method is singularly shrewd and vivid. It was a method which reversed the proper course of

<sup>1</sup> Preface, ch. II.

proof; for by unproved general statements affection was won for the conclusion; and then this affection served to cover the inadequacy of the premisses. The multitude were constantly informed of the faults of those who were set over them (the impression of superior integrity in those who thus informed them naturally rising in their minds); then all these faults were ascribed to the established order of Church government (the impression of wisdom thus enhancing that of integrity); then the Holy Discipline was proposed "as the only sovereign remedy of all evils"; then men's minds were so preoccupied and predisposed that they might read the principles of the Discipline into passages of the Scripture where plain folk saw nothing of the sort, and they were persuaded to regard this their peculiar discernment as a divine illumination, to think of this illumination as sealing and proving them to be God's children, and therefore to cherish, deepen, and display it in all ways, and particularly by the exercise of a generous bounty towards their teachers. The general inducements which have been thus enumerated were brought to bear with especial effect on women, whose manifold aptness to favour and promote such a movement as that of the Puritans is analyzed in a passage of curious penetration—a passage which has been already cited. Women and men alike were settled imperturbably in their allegiance to the cause by a certain invincible satisfaction with their own opinions; and a deeper determination came with the experience of repressive measures, which were regarded as persecution and as conferring the dignity and authority of martyrdom.

Thus it was that the affection of the multitude had been drawn to the Puritans; and such affection hid from untrained, uninformed minds the slightness of the Scriptural or reasonable ground on which the Puritan discipline rested. It should not be forgotten that simple people often had far better causes than any which Hooker here mentions for yielding their affection to Puritanism—causes rising from the indolence and ignorance and inability of their own clergy, the earnestness and sincerity of many among the new teachers, the power of any fragment of truth that is heartily believed and taught. But even these causes do not materially traverse the inference for the sake of which Hooker has dwelt on the inappropriate and illogical methods by which crowds of English people had been got to imagine themselves

convinced that to resist the Holy Discipline was to set aside the will of God and the voice of Scripture. For all that he is here concerned to show is that that conviction had not been logically brought about, and that therefore its wide prevalence yielded no solid presumption of its truth, and no warrant for prejudging the great questions of the controversy.

But Hooker could not fail to see that besides the broad mass of uninstructed and illogical opinion there was a strong force of weightier judgement on the side of the Discipline. His own conflict with Travers, his prolonged difficulty with Travers' adherents in the educated society of the Temple, his knowledge of Cartwright's works, were points at which he had personally come into contact with the Puritanism of learned men; and there could be no doubt that Puritanism had found among the learned many ardent friends—friends whose conspicuous support might create in favour of the cause a more thoughtful presumption than that which rose from its mere popularity. Hooker's plea to bar or suspend this presumption rests on a brief sketch and criticism of the three main groups of arguments,—from Scripture, from antiquity, from contemporary authority,—adduced by educated men in maintenance of the Discipline. His main point against the arguments from Scripture is that if Scripture inculcates the Discipline it is very strange that no one has ever found it out before. The arguments from antiquity are somewhat more fully dealt with. The Puritans cited antiquity; but "for fashion's sake only," with no real reliance on it, with no trust in anything later than the apostolic age. "Back to the Apostles" was the cry both of lay-reformers, who had reasons of their own for wishing to recall the Church to apostolic poverty, and of clerical reformers, who only wished for apostolic polity. But there was little use or sense in this appeal to the pattern of the apostolic polity, since that polity was imperfectly known, and so far as it was known, might not be perfectly applicable to altered times, and certainly in some important matters showed no affinity with the Puritan scheme; while those who appealed to it had their own reserves and suspicions as to the unsullied purity of the Church even in the apostolic age. Lastly, the appeal was made to the authority of learned writers who had upheld the Discipline. It was, according to Hooker, a somewhat indiscriminate appeal to

an authority somewhat loosely constructed : for of the writers so used many were not of real weight or learning, many had not written with any express or precise reference to the issue, many lacked originality, and none had any prerogative right to sit in judgement on the Church of England. There was indeed a considerable measure of agreement among foreign reformers with regard to Church discipline ; but here again the agreement lost much of its argumentative import, its right to create a presumption of its truth, when the circumstances of its development were considered. For the reform of foreign Churches had been carried out under popular pressure, such as urged men to adopt a form of polity which was ready to their hands ; thus the Genevan was adopted, and then had to be defended ; so that the agreement of its defenders came about not by an independent consilience of judgement, but by the derivation of their principles from one source ; that is to say from Calvin. And if it were asked how learned men came to defer thus uncritically to Calvin in this matter, the answer might be—in accordance with some Puritan language—that they were reluctant to think that one so sound in doctrine could be erring in discipline ; their affection for Calvin's theology determined their acceptance of his polity. And thus again the Holy Discipline acquired an impressive mass of support with little independent and logical right to the impression it produced.

In two other ways the Puritans had secured in men's minds an illogical presumption that they were right, by challenging their opponents to submit the case to the test of a public disputation, and by coming before men as the victims of oppression. To the consideration of the advantage accruing to them in these two ways Hooker devotes the latter half of the Preface.

In the appeal for a public disputation there is an air of frank confidence in a strong cause ; the rejection of such an appeal suggests that full inquiry is feared, and tells in favour of the appellants. By way of counteracting this impression Hooker points out first that if the Puritans simply want to have the controversy threshed out in disputation, the Universities offer regular opportunities for that ; but if they mean that the action of the laws is to be suspended until a great concourse is got

together and they are persuaded before it to acknowledge themselves confuted, they are asking what is unreasonable and subversive of all order. They must not think, however, that on the side of authority there is any reluctance to face the issue of debate. Hooker would be glad to have the matter argued out, and he ventures to indicate, and indicates very judiciously, the regulations under which a public conference might be held.

Thus he seeks to dissipate or counteract the illogical advantage which the Puritans gained by appealing for a public disputation. But though he would not refuse to dispute if the proper conditions could be maintained, it is not by this way that truth and peace seem to him likeliest to be reached. There is a surer appeal than that to disputation. It is the appeal which nature, Scripture, and experience commend; the appeal to some high, judicial, and definitive authority, whether it be the authority of a court within the Church and realm of England, or the authority of a general council. In the sixth chapter of the Preface Hooker discusses carefully the relation of such authority to the voice of the individual conscience or the sense of individual conviction. If conscience rests on a clear revelation such as that given to St. Paul, or if conviction rests on demonstrative and necessary proof, such as no man who understands it can reject, then authority must be resisted. Without such revelation or such proof the individual must yield; his probable inference must not prevail against the probability constituted by the judgement of the society; the sentence of a competent authority is enough to warrant conscience in enforcing the duty of obedience.

At this point Hooker has touched, as it were incidentally, a pervading and characteristic principle of his whole treatise, the principle that societies have within a certain area the right to impose and enforce laws on individuals. That right is limited, it cannot overbear express revelation or demonstrative proof; but in the large field of action where neither of these can be produced the authority of the society holds sway, and it is the duty of individual members of the society to obey that authority. This principle with regard to the scope and power of laws enacted by societies is developed in the First Book of the treatise; and the recollection of it is essential to a right understanding of Hooker's position. For it marks what he is and what he is not

obliged to show concerning the laws of the Church. He is not obliged to show that they are demonstrably and necessarily certain and perfect, but only that the Church has with fair reason enacted them, and that there is no demonstrative or necessary reason for rejecting them. For where an individual can show nothing stronger against a law than probable reasoning, the "probable voice" of the society, expressed in the law, requires obedience. Probable ground for the law, and no necessary reason against it—this is what Hooker is concerned to show and content with showing in regard to those requirements of Church authority which the Puritans resented. In his own words: "Nor is mine own intent any other in these several "books of discourse, than to make it appear to you, that for the "ecclesiastical laws of this land, we are led by great reason to "observe them, and ye by no necessity bound to impugn "them."

He has here come to enunciate the main thesis of his work incidentally, in defending himself against the charge of overruling the voice of conscience by the dictates of authority. But having thus come to state his thesis he attaches to it a brief and lucid outline of his plan for all the eight books: and then, drawing his Preface towards its close, he sets himself (in accordance with the aim which has been traced throughout) to dissipate or counteract that prejudice against the Bishops and in favour of the Puritans which the use of coercion in the cause of order was engendering. This seems, at least, to be the motive and aim of the eighth chapter, in which the justification for some severity of repression is based on three considerations. First, the Bishops had seen in the Barrowists (howsoever the Puritans might deplore the haste of those who cried for "Reformation without tarrying "for any") the logical and consistent developement of Puritanism, and were dealing with it in the light of that natural outcome. Secondly, the arguments used by Puritan writers went beyond the sphere of ecclesiastical polity or controversy, and threatened the prerogative of the Crown, the position of the English nobility, the advance of learning and the maintenance of order in the Universities, and the study and authority of the civil law. Thirdly, it was reasonable if not inevitable to remember the Anabaptists in dealing with the Puritans. For when the

Puritans were told of practical dangers and difficulties apparently involved in their principles, they were apt to answer that we must look to God's will and not to convenience, and that what God commands (by which they meant the Puritan Discipline) must be received, at whatsoever cost of social upheaval. But this general principle is of infinite peril when men set about applying it to their own partial, inaccurate, erroneous inferences, as though these were the very commandments of God; since thus the utmost force of divine sanction is put behind movements which are merely human, and with more and more vehemence men identify their own wilfulness with God's will<sup>1</sup>.—The perversion and infatuation and havoc that may be thus wrought is then displayed in a brilliant sketch of the progress of the Anabaptists, under the urgent and confusing force of an absolute belief that it was the will of God that their convictions should be carried out; a sketch in which many phrases describing the Anabaptist position glance also at the Puritan, while throughout the driving power in both agitations is felt to be the same—the resolute, unhesitating, concentrated belief that one's own view of revelation is the only view, and one's own plan God's purpose.—Hooker's plea in defence of coercion is of a kind which is often misused; it is often unjust to deal with men as though their premises contained all that others have got out of them, or even all that they logically imply; but the fanaticism of the Anabaptists was recent and near and serious enough to warrant some genuine and reasonable alarm when a religious agitation invoked the principle which they had pressed with a blind and terrible show of consistency: and certain of the Puritan writers had gone far enough to give good ground for fear, and some ground for the severity that fear dictates, in an age of deep unsettlement. The Bishops might not be acquitted of persecution, but if they were guilty of it there were extenuating circumstances to be alleged: it was not the mere, unreasoning tyranny which provokes honest men to judge that the persecuted must be right.

The Preface ends with a reiterated, earnest, touching plea for peace: an appeal to the Puritans bravely and diligently to re-

<sup>1</sup> It is interesting to compare with this part of the Preface George Cranmer's account of the causes which

led to the decline of the Puritan influence. App. ii. to Bk. V.

examine their cause, to own the greatness of truth wherever it appeared, and to think it their own best victory when the truth prevailed over them.

## II.

The purpose of the First Book is to define the nature of law in general, and to display the universal scheme whereby the eternal law of God is derived and conveyed to all orders of His creatures in regard to all activities of their being. This scheme is a system of laws, that is to say of "directive rules unto goodness of operation<sup>1</sup>," impressed upon God's creatures in diverse ways: by nature, by human enactment, by revelation. In this system the laws of ecclesiastical polity have their place; and the authority they bear, the manner of their enactment, the limits of their scope, can only be rightly estimated when they are seen in their place in the universal scheme. What that scheme is, according to Hooker's view and presentation of it—the scheme in which he thus claims a rightful place and work for the laws of the Church—may be, perhaps, best shown by trying to put the substance of the First Book into the shape of a pedigree, such as is here shown.

In Hooker's survey of the whole scheme of law three points appear to have an especial bearing on the controversy concerning the laws of the Church: in three especial ways this First Book touches the Puritan contention in regard to those laws.

1. The realm of law is shown to be divided into provinces, and it is maintained that guidance is to be sought in each province from the laws properly belonging thereto. It is a characteristic trait of Hooker's mind thus to distinguish and disentangle what careless language has confused, and to try whether conflict of opinion will not abate when the misunderstanding that comes of blurred and vague words is cleared up by defining and marking out precisely what they mean. So here he says, "There are in men operations, some natural, some "rational, some supernatural, some politic, some finally ecclesiastical: which if we measure not each by his own proper law,

<sup>1</sup> I. viii. 4.

"whereas the things themselves are so different, there will be in "our understanding and judgement of them confusion<sup>1</sup>." Life is not a monotonous and indiscriminate plain, to be treated throughout by the same set of rules, promulgated and enforced in the same way. The facts of life are not thus; the will of God has not thus disposed them. The actions of men belong to different spheres or provinces, and each sphere or province has its own body of laws, declared, maintained, modified, and sanctioned in such ways as have seemed good to God, the Author and Source of all law. One action may indeed, in different aspects, belong to more than one province, and fall under the authority of more than one body of laws; but the bodies of laws, the provinces of conduct, are nevertheless distinct, and it is incongruous to appeal to the laws of one province about affairs which distinctly belong to another. "The law of men's actions is one, if they be respected "only as men; and another, when they are considered as parts "of a politic body": and the error of the Puritans is that "by "following the law of private reason, where the law of public "should take place, they breed disturbance<sup>2</sup>." They had not realized the rightful authority of the laws made by a society for its members: and into the province of those laws, the province of ecclesiastical polity, they thrust their own inferences (only probable inferences at the most) from Scripture. They lacked that sense of corporate authority and duty without which corporate life cannot go on, without which societies fall asunder. They withheld, on grounds which could only be valid in the province of individual and private action, that deference which was due to the legislative power of the spiritually united society called the Church.

2. But while it is thus necessary to recognize the several sorts of laws in the several provinces of human life, it is necessary also to remember that all are of God, all derived from the same eternal law, reading itself out to the world<sup>3</sup>, as it were, in diverse ways, impressing on men in diverse ways and bearing into their hearts by diverse agencies the form of that good which their wills should seek<sup>4</sup>: that good in seeking which they fulfil the

<sup>1</sup> I. xvi. 5. Cf. Dante, *De Monarchiâ*, Bk. III. § 14. "Virtus autorizandi

"regnum nostræ mortalitatis est

"contra naturam Ecclesiæ."

<sup>2</sup> I. xvi. 6.

<sup>3</sup> I. xvi. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Bk. V. App. i. § 9.

essential law of their nature and draw nearer to God. This is the secret of the coherence of all laws, the unity of all excellence. Thus it is that in every province of life alike God is glorified by obedience to the laws of that province: for it is a narrow view of man's life and of God's glory that restricts and bounds by the Scriptures man's way of setting forth that glory<sup>1</sup>. Thus, again, the laws of one province have their reflection and analogy in the laws of another: the natural law, for instance, of the love which must unite husband and wife is reflected in the supernatural law of the relation between Christ and His Church<sup>2</sup>. And thus especially is shown the duty of reverence for law in all its provinces and manifestations; since in all it is the expression, the rendering, the application of God's eternal law. "Although we perceive not the goodness of laws made, nevertheless sith things in themselves may have that which we peradventure discern not, should not this breed a fear in our hearts, how we speak or judge in the worse part concerning that, the unadvised disgrace whereof may be no mean dishonour to Him, towards whom we profess all submission and awe<sup>3</sup>?" Men are not free to say what they will as they will of the laws of civil or of ecclesiastical polity, because they regard them as mere human enactments; for though their enactment be by human societies, yet if those societies are exercising therein their proper power in the divine order, the laws which they enact are true branches of the law of God<sup>4</sup>.

3. A point of great importance and prominence in the controversy is touched when Hooker comes to speak of the permanence and mutability of laws. The subject recurs in the Third Book, and it will be convenient here to combine what is said in both places.

Laws are permanent or mutable according as the subject with which they deal, and their aptness to secure the end for which they were designed, abide constantly or change. If the subject-matter

<sup>1</sup> I. xvi. 5; cf. II. ii. 1: "Unto His glory even these things are done which we naturally perform, and not only that which morally and spiritually we do. For by every effect proceeding from the most concealed instincts of nature His power is made manifest."

<sup>2</sup> I. xvi. 3.

<sup>3</sup> I. xvi. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. VII. xi. 10, xiv. 3; VIII App. No. 1. Dante, *De Monarchiâ*, Bk. III. § 15. "Auctoritas temporalis monarchæ, sine ullo medio, in ipsum de fonte universalis auctoritatis descendit."

of the law be constant, and if the law be effectual, then the law is permanent; if the subject-matter undergoes change, or if the law ceases to be effectual, the law is mutable, by whatsoever authority it was enacted. Thus natural laws are all permanent, since they deal with essential and permanent relations of human life; of positive laws (of laws, that is to say, which have no binding force until they are enacted), some are permanent, some mutable,—“Whether God or man be the maker of them, alteration they so far forth admit as the matter doth exact<sup>1</sup>.” It is no disparagement to a law, or to the authority enacting it, to say that it is mutable; if the matter concerning which it is enacted, or its own relation to that matter, is changed, the law would be faulty and harmful if it were stiffly to refuse all change. “God never ordained any thing that could be bettered. Yet many things He hath that have been changed, and that for the better. That which succeedeth as better now when change is requisite, had been worse when that which now is changed was instituted.” “In this case, therefore, men do not presume to change God’s ordinance, but they yield thereunto requiring itself to be changed<sup>2</sup>.”

The principle thus enunciated is illustrated in the laws given by God to the Jews: of these (*a*) some were moral laws, and, their end and their aptness both abiding, they abide unchanged; (*b*) some were ceremonial, and they are changed because their end has ceased; (*c*) some were such as that which ordained that theft should be punished by quadruple restitution, and these are changed because they have lost aptness for the unchanged end.

It is indeed true that “laws which of their own nature are changeable” are, “notwithstanding, incapable of change, if he which gave them, being of authority so to do, forbid absolutely to change them.” If our Lord had in the Gospel so set down a Church Polity, and forbidden that it should be changed, man could not change it. But this He has nowhere done, and those who stretch the immutability of His revelation to cover all points of polity confound a deep distinction. For “there is no reason in the world wherefore we should esteem it as necessary always to do, as always to believe, the same things; seeing every man

<sup>1</sup> I. xv. 1. Cf. Sermon iii. pp. 618, 619.

<sup>2</sup> III. x. 5.

"knoweth that the matter of faith is constant, the matter contrariwise of action daily changeable, especially the matter of action belonging unto church polity<sup>1</sup>."

### III.

In the First Book Hooker has set forth the true conception of law, and of all life as governed by law; in the Second he deals with that deep principle of the Puritans which most broadly and directly traverses this conception—the principle that Scripture "is in such sort the rule of human actions, that simply whatsoever we do and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin." "Whereas God hath left sundry kinds of laws unto men, and by all those laws the actions of men are in some sort directed; they" (the Puritans) "hold that one only law, the Scripture, must be the rule to direct in all things<sup>2</sup>."

The main ground on which Hooker rejects this principle has been displayed in the First Book: it reappears naturally at many points in the Second. But there appear also in the Second principles of great importance for the delineation of his position; and it seems more profitable here to speak of these than to follow in detail his answers to the arguments by which the Puritans defended their exclusive maintenance of Scripture as the only rule of action.

1. There is deep and lasting worth in what he says of the diverse degrees of evidence and assent. The Puritan principle would have led men to regard life as a flat surface all equally lit from one source of evidence, the Scripture, which required always from men one form of acknowledgement, an absolute and settled assent. But here, again, the facts of life are not thus. As a matter of fact, the mind has to deal with a scene of wide and manifold diversity, in which some parts are near, some far distant, some conspicuous and clear, some recondite and obscure, some now seen, now lost to sight, some never more than guessed at, some of which different views may reasonably be taken. And corresponding to these degrees of evidence there are like

<sup>1</sup> III. x. 7.

<sup>2</sup> II. i. 3, 2. Cf. *supra*, p. 40 in the

note on the account given of the Admonitions.

degrees of assent, varying between certain conviction and suspense of judgement. The evidence of plain Scripture, the evidence of sense, the evidence of invincible demonstration, the evidence of preponderating probability, the evidence of human authority, all command their corresponding measure of assent. And this correspondent adaptation of assent to evidence in each case is both a fact of experience, since "the truth is, that how bold and "confident soever we may be in words, when it cometh to the "point of trial, such as the evidence is which the truth hath "either in itself or through proof, such is the heart's assent "thereunto; neither can it be stronger, being grounded as it "should be": and also a religious duty, since "then are our "consciences best resolved, and in most agreeable sort unto "God and nature settled, when they are so far persuaded as "those grounds of persuasion which are to be had will bear<sup>1</sup>."

Here again, as in the First Book, the strength of Hooker's position lies in a broad and frank appeal to facts—an appeal which has in it a remarkable anticipation of Bishop Butler's method and temper. He can and does meet in detail the arguments of the Puritans; he shows their misuse of texts, their misunderstanding of the Fathers, their inconsistency; but his great, abiding work is the confronting of their cramped, unnatural, unphilosophical view of life with another view—a view which needs no further commendation and defence than that which it draws from the experience of life and thought. Men do think and live thus; and their reason and their conscience sanction it. And thinking and living thus, and knowing that this is substantially the true view of things, they cannot be hemmed in and precluded from all judgement and action for which there is not an express, particular passage of Scripture to be alleged; they cannot be required to discard all grounds of belief outside the words of the Bible. For "Wisdom hath diversely imparted her treasures unto "the world. As her ways are of sundry kinds, so her manner "of teaching is not merely one and the same. Some things she "openeth by the sacred books of Scripture; some things by the "glorious works of Nature: with some things she inspireth "them from above by spiritual influence; in some things she "leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and

<sup>1</sup> II. vii. 5.

“practice. We may not so in any one special kind admire her, “that we disgrace her in any other; but let all her ways be “according unto their place and degree adored<sup>1</sup>.”

2. Analogous to Hooker's view of the nature and conditions of evidence and assent is his view of the different degrees of goodness in the good deeds of men, and the corresponding difference in the manner of God's sanction and approval of them. Here again he broadens out the field before he traces his lines of distinction. All actions of rational men are either good or evil, and there are good actions which do not come within the sphere of goodness that is marked out by the requirements and promises of the Scripture. These requirements and promises concern the way of salvation, the duties which God appoints in Scripture for those who shall be saved. But besides these there are, on the one hand, those natural duties, those elementary forms of goodness, which reason and conscience have prescribed for all men, which the heathen recognize, which Scripture rather assumes or ratifies than expressly inculcates—such duties as those of gratitude and natural affection: and, on the other hand, those high and extraordinary acts of heroism and sacrifice which Scripture may prompt but not dictate, which spring from the divinely quickened impulses of saintliness, unrequired, undictated by any express and particular commandment—such ventures of goodness as St. Paul's choice of celibacy, and refusal for his work's sake of the maintenance he might rightly have received. Approved they are by God and amply rewarded: and on such forms of goodness “dependeth whatsoever “difference there is between the states of saints in glory<sup>2</sup>”; whereas if the words of Scripture were, in the Puritan sense, “the only rule of all things which in this life may be done by “men<sup>3</sup>,” it would be hard to find a sanction for them. In them, as in mere rational good conduct, men are otherwise guided to please God than by the express terms of His written word.

3. In close connexion with this point is Hooker's firm and careful definition of that true scope and purpose of Scripture, in regard to which it is absolutely perfect. But this may best be considered with reference to the Third Book, where it is more fully

<sup>1</sup> II. i. 4.

<sup>2</sup> II. viii. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Title of Book II.

treated; and it seems well similarly to defer considering what he has to say about the proper place of human authority in matters of religion.

#### IV.

In the Third Book Hooker deals with an assertion which was meant to serve as a major premise for settling the controversy: the assertion "that in Scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in nowise be altered." For it seemed to the Puritans derogatory to the importance of Church polity and to the completeness of Scripture to doubt that Scripture had made full and permanent provision for the government and discipline and order of the Church.

1. Few words, perhaps, are used more loosely and uncertainly than the word Church; few words stand more often in sentences which men would have to reconsider and perhaps recast if they thought out definitely what they mean. It is an instance of Hooker's honesty and courage in trying to get as near the bottom of things as he can that he begins the Third Book by asking what the Church is. In examining his answer it should be borne in mind that he raises and considers the question with a special reference; that is, in order to see clearly "in what respect laws of polity or government are necessary" to the Church. His answer may be liked or disliked; but it is intelligible, and consistent, and well worth studying.

He begins by noticing a sense and use of the word Church which cannot be that which it has in the controversy with the Puritans, since the Church in this sense needs no external polity. The Church mystical, the mystical body of Christ, cannot be distinguished or reckoned up or circumscribed by men; it has indeed its distinctive marks, its clear and certain lineaments; but they are seen by God alone. He alone discerns the company who, in this world and beyond it, form the Church in this sense—the sense that some express by the phrase, "*Anima Ecclesiæ*"; as when it is said, "*Omnes et soli iusti ad animam Ecclesiæ pertinent.*"

Clearly it is not in this sense that men debate about the government and discipline of the Church. What they think of when they so speak is a visible society, moving among the things of this world, discerned, whether more or less precisely, by men, capable of being rightly or wrongly regarded and treated by them, susceptible of the designations that human thought, correctly or incorrectly, can apply to it. And so it is with the Church as "a sensibly known company" that questions and systems of ecclesiastical polity have to do; and it is of the Church thus understood that Hooker next speaks, and usually speaks. What then, in this sense of the Church's name, the sense in which it falls under human cognizance and observation and discussion, is its definition; and what are the bounds drawn by its distinctive marks? Plain and large, according to Hooker's view. All who own Christ as Lord, and embrace the faith He published, and have been baptized, are members of His visible Church. They may be impious, idolatrous, heretical, wicked, excommunicate; and still, if they have these three notes, if thus they are by external profession Christians, they belong to the Church.

This may well seem bold and startling language; it may look like loose dealing with great words; it may be blamed as making the Church so wide that the name loses meaning, or as thrusting among spiritual associations a hard, external, worldly, material sort of definition—a kingdom of this world, for which mere secular authority might prescribe the qualifications. But within the society that he thus externally defines Hooker has a distinction to indicate of supreme importance.

"Men remain in the visible Church till they utterly renounce the profession of Christianity<sup>1</sup>"; unsound in doctrine, vicious in life, they are still members of it if they have been baptized, if they hold the main substance of the faith, if they acknowledge Christ as Lord. But it by no means follows that membership in all cases means or conveys the same. The bond of a man's communion with the body, the solidity of his inherence in it, the channel which conveys to him its life, the strength of his hold upon its privileges, the claim or hope his place in it allows him, may be weakened and attenuated almost to nothing; he may be

<sup>1</sup> III. i. 12. Cf. VIII. i. 2; Sermon ii. §§ 9, 16, 17, 27; Sermon v. § 11.

as a feeble, crippled, paralysed limb, or as a branch that is all but broken off, half-nourished, withering, drawing from the tree just life enough to put forth for a little while a few leaves, liable at any moment to be torn away and die. The visible Church can only be defined, according to the judgement and for the purposes of this life, by visible marks; where these are, membership must be accorded, though discipline may curtail or refuse the right to share in outward acts. But within this broad inclusion there is deep distinction: distinction between, on the one hand, the sound members of the Church, in full communion with her, accepting heartily her discipline, believing sincerely all the articles of her faith, joining in her worship, nourished with the fullness of her life, growing continually in her holiness, characterized as "the very true Church of Christ"; and, on the other hand, those who are, in various degrees, unsound, defective, and corrupt members: some less, some more impaired and faulty and precarious. A few passages may be cited as summing up most clearly Hooker's view of membership in the Church:—"Albeit  
 "not every error and fault, yet heresies and crimes which are not  
 "actually repented of and forsaken, exclude quite and clean from  
 "that salvation which belongeth unto the mystical body of  
 "Christ; yea, they also make a separation from the visible  
 "sound Church of Christ; altogether from the visible Church  
 "neither the one nor the other doth sever. As for the act of  
 "excommunication, it neither shutteth out from the mystical, nor  
 "clean from the visible, but only from fellowship with the visible  
 "in holy duties." "Both heresy and *many other crimes* which  
 "*wholly sever from God* do sever from the Church of God *in part*  
 "*only*." "The Church of God may therefore contain both them  
 "which indeed are not His, yet must be reputed His by us that  
 "know not their inward thoughts, and them whose apparent  
 "wickedness testifieth even in the sight of the whole world that  
 "God abhorreth them. For to this and no other purpose are  
 "meant those parables which our Saviour in the Gospel hath  
 "concerning mixture of vice with virtue, light with darkness,  
 "truth with error, as well an openly known and seen as a  
 "cunningly cloked mixture.

"That which separateth therefore *utterly*, that which cutteth  
 "off *clean* from the visible Church of Christ, is plain apostasy,

"direct denial, utter rejection of the whole Christian faith as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity. Heretics as touching those points of doctrine wherein they fail; schismatics as touching the quarrels for which or the duties wherein they divide themselves from their brethren; licentious and wicked persons as touching their several offences or crimes, have all forsaken the true Church of God, the Church which is sound and sincere in the doctrine that they corrupt, the Church that keepeth the bond of unity which they violate, the Church that walketh in the laws of righteousness which they transgress, this very true Church of Christ they have left, howbeit not altogether left nor forsaken simply the Church upon the main foundations whereof they continue built, notwithstanding these breaches whereby they are *rent at the top* asunder<sup>1</sup>."

Such is Hooker's conception of the Church, in that regard, in that sense of the word, with which laws of ecclesiastical polity are concerned. It would be inappropriate to the purpose of this Introduction to discuss the questions which his language may suggest. But it may be said that here, as elsewhere, Hooker will be justly judged only if he is judged with careful attention to the express restrictions and qualifications under which he speaks. He is a frank and scrupulous writer; and he is easily misjudged if he is tried by fragments of his teaching, or apart from his guarding clauses, or with forgetfulness of the difficulties which he has fully taken into account.

The Church thus conceived is divided by local distinctions. As the whole world-wide sea "within divers precincts hath divers names," so men distinguish the Church of Rome, Corinth, Ephesus, England<sup>2</sup>. These local or national Churches have their own notes or general properties; their functions, their forms and ways of life and work, "belonging unto them as they are public Christian societies": and one of the chief of these properties is polity.

<sup>1</sup> III. i. 13; V. lxviii. 6. Cf. Whitgift's Answer to the Admonition Cartwright's Reply: Whitgift's Defence: in Whitgift's Works (Parker Society, vol. i. pp. 382-389): Cartwright's Second Reply, p. ccxlv: Field, Of the Church, bk. i. ch. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker guards himself from

seeming to accept the congregational principle, which would give the name of a Church to each Christian assembly; for "assemblies properly are rather things that belong to a Church," than in themselves Churches. III. i. 14.

2. Hooker uses the word Polity advisedly, and it is important to remember what he means it to include. Three words may have been before him when he chose it—discipline, government, and polity. Against the first one may imagine two objections: that it had been so appropriated and hard-worked by the Puritans that at that moment it was impossible to disentangle it from complex and complicating associations in men's minds; and that properly it belonged to one department of Church ordering, the exercise of censure, rather than to the whole. The word Government Hooker set aside because it was ordinarily understood to refer only to "the exercise of superiority peculiar unto Rulers "and Guides of others<sup>1</sup>." He chose Polity because it would include "both government and also whatsoever besides belongeth "to the ordering of the Church in public<sup>2</sup>." It was not a new term; it had been used by Travers in his definition of Discipline<sup>3</sup>, and by Gerson in the fifteenth century<sup>4</sup>.—Hooker's use of it seems somewhat wider than the classical analogy would suggest. For him it includes not only the manner of Church government and the relation of the several orders in the Church, but also the manner of the administration of the Word and Sacraments, the regulation of the form of Public Prayer, the ordering of rites, ceremonies, customs, ornaments, and observances, the exercise of censure and dispensation. Thus, speaking broadly, all that the Puritans in the Admonitions had assailed, and all that Hooker in the Fifth Book of his treatise defends, falls within the scope of polity. Some polity there must be in every Church, for a Church is a society and not a horde; and also for the corporate and public actions of the Church there must be some prescribed order. Thus the polity of a Church is one of its essential notes, a part of its right to be called a Church. But it does not follow that the form of polity in all Churches must be the same. To certain general principles of government and to certain public religious duties every Church is always bound; and Scripture has prescribed the manner of governing in general, and the things of principal weight in the form of Church polity<sup>5</sup>; but beyond these there is, according to Hooker, a sphere of judgement,

<sup>1</sup> III. i. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Id. *ibid.* Cf. VIII. ii. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> R. W. Church's ed. of Hooker, Book I. p. xxiii, note a.

<sup>5</sup> III. xi. 20, and III. iv.

decision, and direction in which another authority than that of the express words of Scripture has its proper field<sup>1</sup>. What that authority is, and why it must be regarded as divinely sanctioned, Hooker has already shown; but at point after point his consistent reliance on it will be apparent.

3. It may be well here to consider what is the outcome of the various passages in which Hooker speaks of the limitation and of the sufficiency of Scripture, and of its relation to human authority and human reason. The Scripture is perfect in relation to the end for which it was given. It was given to make known to men, who had already the law of nature, the supernatural way of salvation<sup>2</sup>; to teach men how that sovereign good which is desired naturally must now supernaturally be attained; to lay before them fully all the duties which God requires of them as necessary to salvation. For this end it is complete: "What the Scripture purposeth, the same in all points it doth perform"; "whatsoever to make up the doctrine of man's salvation is added, as in supply of the Scripture's insufficiency, we reject it. Scripture purposing this, hath perfectly and fully done it<sup>3</sup>."

That the Scripture is thus perfect, "and wanteth nothing requisite unto that purpose for which God delivered the same," Hooker constantly maintains. With a divine fullness of achievement, the way of everlasting life for fallen man is revealed in the pages of the Bible. But this revelation does not efface the conditions, dispense with the efforts, preclude or forestall the operations of human faculties and human life. It comes among men as a transcendent manifestation of God's care and goodness; it uses, it crowns, it advances and illuminates the powers of men, the processes by which men move towards the knowledge of truth; it does not overbear them, or drive them from the fields

<sup>1</sup> Three main and necessary principles of Church Polity are enunciated at the end of the Third Book: the distinction between clergy and laity, the distinction of at least two degrees of clergy, and the solemn admittance of the clergy to their charge. Besides these there are many particularities, "not of such constant use and necessity in God's Church": including "even whatsoever doth by way of

"formality and circumstance concern any public action of the Church." In this latter part of Ecclesiastical Polity "much of that which the Scripture teacheth is not always needful; and much the Church of God shall always need which the Scripture teacheth not." III. xi. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Bk. V. App. i. § 7, Sermon iii. p. 600.

<sup>3</sup> II. viii. 5.

where God meant them to be exercised. The late Dean of St. Paul's noticed that the word *presupposes* is a favourite word with Hooker<sup>1</sup>; and it is a word that may well be used at many points to mark the bearing and expectation with which the revelation of God's Word comes into the world.

For Scripture presupposes, first, in men the knowledge (more or less distinct) of the law of nature or of reason, that law "which men "by discourse of natural reason have rightly found out themselves "to be all for ever bound unto in their actions"; those "several "grand mandates, which being imposed by the understanding "faculty of the mind, must be obeyed by the will of man<sup>2</sup>." Of those mandates, thus naturally to be discovered and acknowledged by men, some are appropriated and republished by the Scripture ("the Spirit, as it were, borrowing them from the school of "Nature<sup>3</sup>"); some are tacitly presumed as guiding men in the common affairs of life, where there is no express sentence of Scripture for their direction, where they are left to that light of nature, that common discretion and judgement, with which God has naturally endued them<sup>4</sup>.

Secondly, Scripture presupposes the continuance and action of that legislative power which belongs naturally to societies of men, that power whereby laws human or politic are enacted. This power is presupposed and has its proper field left to it both by the reticence of Scripture, its abstinence from certain parts of life in regard to which guidance is needed, and also by the manner in which some parts of the teaching of Scripture are given. For, in the first place, "a number of things there are for which the "Scripture hath not provided by any law, but left them unto the "careful discretion of the Church"; and, in the second place, the guidance of Scripture is conveyed in diverse forms, admitting some uncertainty of application to details: and, therefore "when "Scripture doth yield us precedents, how far forth they are to be "followed; when it giveth natural laws, what particular order is "thereunto most agreeable; when positive, which way to make "laws unrepugnant unto them; yea, though all these should want, "yet what kind of ordinances would be most for that good of the

<sup>1</sup> R. W. Church: Hooker, Bk. I. p. xvii. It is interesting to find a like use and prominence of the word in Pecock's Repressor of over-much

blaming of the Clergy. Cf. Part I, chapters 4 and 5.

<sup>2</sup> I. viii. 8, 7.

<sup>3</sup> I. xii. 1.

<sup>4</sup> II. viii. 6.

"Church which is aimed at, all this must be by reason found out": by that reason whereby with the aid of divine grace those who have lawful authority draw human laws by probable inference from the laws of nature and of God<sup>1</sup>.

Thirdly, Scripture presupposes the work both of human authority and of reason for the establishment of its own sacred authority, as the Word of God. No Scripture can teach us that the Scriptures are the oracles of God (since the Scripture so teaching us would be resting simply on its own witness), nor can we say that this is in itself evident. But as every kind of science "presupposeth many necessary things learned in other sciences "and known beforehand": as rhetoric, for instance, presupposes the knowledge of grammar; so Scripture teaches the way of salvation "with presupposal of knowledge concerning certain "principles whereof it receiveth us already persuaded, and then "instructeth us in all the residue that are necessary. In the "number of these principles one is the sacred authority of "Scripture<sup>2</sup>." By what means, then, are we persuaded of this? Hooker sketches the process in a passage of great interest<sup>3</sup>, showing how authority and reason both bear part in this fundamental conviction—a passage so lucid and concise and strong that it may best be cited simply as it stands: "By experience "we all know that the first outward motive leading men so to "esteem of the Scripture is the authority of God's Church. For "when we know the whole Church of God hath that opinion of "the Scripture, we judge it even at the first an impudent thing "for any man bred and brought up in the Church to be of "a contrary mind without cause. Afterwards the more we "bestow our labour in reading or hearing the mysteries thereof, "the more we find that the thing itself doth answer our received "opinion concerning it. So that the former inducement prevailing "somewhat with us before, doth now much more prevail, when "the very thing hath ministered farther reason. If infidels or "atheists chance at any time to call it in question, this giveth us "occasion to sift what reason there is, whereby the testimony of "the Church concerning Scripture, and our own persuasion which "Scripture itself hath confirmed, may be proved a truth infallible."

<sup>1</sup> III. ix. 1, viii. 18. Cf. I. xvi. 5, III. xi. 16, II. vii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> I. xiv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> III. viii. 14.

The tradition and authority with which a man finds himself encompassed; the witness of his own heart and conscience, recognizing and responding to the Spirit which meets him in the Bible; the scrutiny and appraising of the credentials which it offers to his reason: such is the threefold process which a man may use, and which the Bible presupposes for the warrant of its claim to teach in God's Name, with His authority, the means whereby men now must reach the end for which they were created.

Lastly, Scripture presupposes again the action of human reason and authority for its apprehension and interpretation. Against the Puritan disparagement of reason, against the vulgar disdaining of human faculties, "as if the way to be ripe in faith were to be "raw in wit and judgement<sup>1</sup>," Hooker constantly insists that as nature hath need of grace, so grace hath use of nature<sup>2</sup>; and that it is through the exercise of reason under the influence of grace<sup>3</sup> that the boundless light which God has stored in the Scripture is more and more elicited and received into the soul. It is the light of natural reason that shineth in a man "and "maketh him apt to apprehend those things of God which, being "by grace discovered, are effectual to persuade reasonable minds, "and none other, that honour, obedience, and credit belong of "right unto God<sup>4</sup>." Reason is "as a necessary instrument, "without which we could not reap by the Scripture's perfection "that fruit and benefit which it yieldeth<sup>5</sup>." And as in Christian men individually the exercise of reason, quickened and enlightened by grace, is thus necessary for advance in the apprehension of the truth which God has revealed, so the gathered wisdom of the past, "the credit of learned men's judgements in opening "that truth<sup>6</sup>," the authority that rightly accrues to study and saintliness, has its place in enriching the Church with a fuller and surer discernment of the treasure that is contained in Scripture. "For whatsoever we believe concerning salvation by "Christ, although the Scripture be therein the ground of our

<sup>1</sup> III. viii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Book V. App. i. § i.

<sup>3</sup> "In all which hitherto hath been "spoken touching the force and use "of man's reason in things divine, "I must crave that I be not so understood or construed, as if any such

"thing by virtue thereof could be "done without the aid and assistance "of God's most blessed Spirit." III. viii. 18. Cf. Answer to Travers, § 24.

<sup>4</sup> III. viii. 11.

<sup>5</sup> III. viii. 10.

<sup>6</sup> II. vii. 6.

"belief; yet the authority of man is, if we mark it, the key which openeth the door of entrance into the knowledge of the Scripture. The Scripture could not teach us the things that are of God unless we did credit men who have taught us that the words of Scripture do signify those things." Human faculties, "furnished with necessary helps, exercised in Scripture . . . with diligence, and assisted with the grace of God<sup>1</sup>," may attain to such knowledge as no man may safely or rightly scorn to be affected by in questions of faith. The instruction of the Church by such knowledge, as well as the dutiful exercise of each man's understanding, is presupposed by the revelation of God's truth in Scripture.

It has seemed well thus to show somewhat fully Hooker's teaching with regard to the perfection and the limitation of the Scripture—with regard to that which it fulfils and that which it presupposes. For his teaching on these points is characteristic and far-reaching. It is characteristic in its breadth of view, its resolute recognition of all the facts, its sensitive reverence for all that comes, in whatever way, from God, its frankness, its courageous reliance on the rightful strength of all truth, howsoever manifested, and wheresoever found. And it is important over a field wider than that in which it is immediately employed. It forms a great and essential part of Hooker's position over against the main Puritan position; of that presentment of life which he sets in challenging contrast with their narrow and partial conception of it; of that large and trustful and philosophic view of things which he could safely leave to be tried by time and by experience, in comparison with a system that narrowed down the revelation of God's will to one alone of all the many means by which He has made it known and enabled men to know it. It was not difficult to meet the arguments of the Puritans; and Hooker meets them at point after point, fairly, ably, effectively. But it was a greater and more lasting work that he achieved by displaying and maintaining a conception of human life and history and hope before which the arguments he answers seem scarcely to need answering, and the whole controversy looks at times unreal and antiquated<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> II. vii. 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. W. Church, Hooker, Bk. I, Introduction, pp. xvi-xx.

The drift of Hooker's teaching about the limitation of Scripture made him liable to misrepresentation in two ways. It was possible to suggest to timid and inattentive minds that he treated Scripture disrespectfully; and it was possible to suggest that he had at least a suspicion that the Puritan theory of Church government was scriptural, and that for this reason he was anxious to shift matters of Church polity on to another ground.

The former of the two suggestions needs but little notice. It was unjust and unreasonable enough to move even Hooker to some impatience. "I think of the Scripture of God," he wrote in the margin of his copy of the tract which thus slandered him<sup>1</sup>, "as reverently as the best of the purified crew in the world. I except not any; no, not the founders themselves and captains of that faction. In which mind I hope by the grace of Almighty God that I shall both live and die." The whole tone and temper of his work is such as to repel the slander. It was with a sensitive care for the honour of the Scriptures that he warned men not to "rack and stretch" their authority further than it was ever meant to reach. "Whatsoever is spoken of God or things appertaining to God otherwise than as the truth is, though it seem an honour it is an injury. And as incredible praises given unto men do often abate and impair the credit of their deserved commendation; so we must likewise take great heed, lest in attributing unto Scripture more than it can have, the incredibility of that do cause even those things which indeed it hath most abundantly to be less reverently esteemed<sup>2</sup>." His own entire deference to the authority of the express teaching of Scripture is not doubtful: "Scripture with Christian men being received as the Word of God; that for which we have probable, yea, that which we have necessary reason for, yea, that which we see with our eyes, is not thought so sure as that which the Scripture of God teacheth; because we hold that His speech revealeth there what Himself seeth<sup>3</sup>."

The other suggestion touches the question how far Hooker would have claimed the express authority of Scripture for the polity of the English Church. That he did not hold the Puritan or Genevan polity to be scriptural he says very plainly: "Our

<sup>1</sup> The Christian Letter. Cf. *infra*, vol. i. pp. xvii-xxvii, 373, 374 note. Chapter vi, and Hooker, ed. Keble, <sup>2</sup> II. viii. 5, 7. <sup>3</sup> II. vii. 5.

"persuasion is, that no age ever had knowledge of it but only "ours; that they which defend it devised it; that neither Christ "nor His Apostles at any time taught it, but the contrary<sup>1</sup>." That he did hold the Anglican polity in its main and principal points to be scriptural he sufficiently shows. Its defence on this ground was not at the moment his task; he had another and a broader argument to maintain; but incidentally he indicates what he was ready to uphold. "The government that is by Bishops" he held to be "that which best agreeth with the "sacred Scripture<sup>2</sup>"; and "forasmuch as where the clergy are "any great multitude, order doth necessarily require that by "degrees they be distinguished," he held that "there have ever "been and ever ought to be in such case at leastwise two sorts "of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate to the other; as "to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always "since, we find plainly both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical "records other ministers of the Word and Sacraments have "been<sup>3</sup>."

These two passages seem to give clearness and definition to two others of great interest. In one he says that the Scriptures contain those things "which are of principal weight in the very "particular form of Church polity (although not that form which "they imagine, but that which we against them uphold<sup>4</sup>)." In the other he says that he is aware that "the very best way for us "and the strongest against" the Puritans would be to accept the Puritan contention that there must be in Scripture a particular form of Church polity<sup>5</sup>. This he will not do because he cares more for truth than for victory. But his language seems to imply that he felt as sure of the Anglican's strength as of the Puritan's weakness, if the question between the two ways of Church government were to be referred to the voice of Scripture. Certainly it is with no uneasiness as to the conclusion that he declines the major premise of the Puritans.

It seems in place here to notice some of the important passages of the Seventh Book which show somewhat further and more definitely what Hooker thought about the origin and sanction of Episcopacy.

<sup>1</sup> III. x. 8.

<sup>4</sup> III. iv.

<sup>2</sup> III. xi. 16.

<sup>5</sup> III. x. 8.

<sup>3</sup> III. xi. 20.

He expressly owns that his mind had undergone some change concerning it: for he speaks of the "conjecture" "merely that "after the Apostles were deceased, Churches did agree amongst "themselves for preservation of peace and order, to make one "presbyter in each city chief over the rest, and to translate into "him that power by force and virtue whereof the Apostles, while "they were alive, did preserve and uphold order in the Church," as a conjecture "which myself did sometimes judge a great deal "more probable than now I do." It was characteristic of him, and a natural outcome of his early training and of the conditions of his time, that he should thus gradually form his judgement where he found himself diverging from many of whom he thought with deference and respect: but he reached at last a deliberate agreement with "the general received persuasion held "from the first beginning, that the Apostles themselves left "bishops invested with power above other pastors<sup>1</sup>." And so he declares his judgement on this point without hesitation: "This we boldly therefore set down as a most infallible truth, ""that the Church of Christ is at this day lawfully, and so hath ""been sithence the first beginning, governed by Bishops, having ""permanent superiority, and ruling power over other ministers of ""the word and sacraments." "Let us not fear to be herein "bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's govern- ""ment, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, ""was even of God, the Holy Ghost was the author of it<sup>2</sup>."

But while he held this clear conviction on the chief point, he maintained a reserve which is also characteristic of his habit of mind and general position. For he refused to infer from the divine sanction of Episcopacy any sweeping conclusion as to the absolute and invariable necessity of it. In accordance with his constant view of the relation between general laws and special equity<sup>3</sup>, he held that while "the whole Church visible being the "true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed "any other than bishops alone to ordain: howbeit, as the "ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it

<sup>1</sup> VII. xi. 8.—The course of thought in concurrence with (and, it may be, under the influence of) which Hooker's mind thus moved, is shown in Keble's Preface to Hooker, §§

35-38.

<sup>2</sup> VII. iii. 1, v. 10. Cf. VII. i. 4, vi. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *infra*, pp. 129, 205, and V. ix. 1, 3, lxxxi. 4.

"may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways."

"Men," he continues, "may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted unto spiritual functions in the Church. One is, when God Himself doth of Himself raise up any, whose labour He useth without requiring that men should authorize them; but then He doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens Himself from heaven." . . . "Luther did but reasonably therefore, in declaring that the senate of Mulheuse should do well to ask of Muncer, from whence he received power to teach, who it was that had called him; and if his answer were that God had given him his charge, then to require at his hands some evident sign thereof for man's satisfaction: because so God is wont, when He Himself is the author of any extraordinary calling."

"Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we would willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. These cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops: by the imposition of their hands it is, that the Church giveth power of order, both unto presbyters and deacons<sup>1</sup>."

Similarly, in accordance with his constant belief in the legislative power of the Church where no express declaration of Scripture and no demonstrative argument of reason could be adduced, Hooker held that the universal Church might even deal with the authority of Bishops.—"Bishops, albeit they may avouch with conformity of truth that their authority hath thus descended even from the very Apostles themselves, yet the absolute and everlasting continuance of it they cannot say that

<sup>1</sup> VII. xiv. 11. Cf., for a particular instance of the equity here vindicated, Hooker's language about "the defect and imperfection" which he "had

"rather lament in such case than exagitate," in the Scottish and French reformed Churches. III. xi. 16.

“any commandment of the Lord doth enjoin; and therefore  
 “must acknowledge that the Church hath power by universal  
 “consent upon urgent cause to take it away, if thereunto she be  
 “constrained through the proud, tyrannical, and unreformable  
 “dealings of her bishops, whose regiment she hath thus long de-  
 “lighted in, because she hath found it good and requisite to be so  
 “governed.” . . . “Let this consideration be a bridle unto them,  
 “let it teach them not to disdain the advice of their presbyters,  
 “but to use their authority with so much the greater humility  
 “and moderation, as a sword which the Church hath power to  
 “take from them<sup>1</sup>.”

These are great and serious reserves. But, before they are taken either by Anglicans or by Non-Conformists to invalidate Hooker's teaching as to the Divine and Apostolic origin of Episcopacy, it would be well for the former to consider carefully not only the conditions of the transitional age in which Hooker wrote, but also what they themselves are prepared to maintain as universally true concerning Non-Episcopal ordinations: and for the latter to do full justice to the strong words with which Hooker restricts his allowance of any departure from that on which he emphatically insists as ordained of God to be the government of the Church<sup>2</sup>.

## V.

In the Fourth Book Hooker deals with another general ground of Puritan antagonism to the rites and ceremonies of the Church; the assertion “that our form of Church polity is corrupted  
 “with Popish orders, rites, and ceremonies, banished out of certain  
 “reformed Churches, whose example therein we ought to have  
 “followed.” There is little in the Book that is necessary for the appreciation of the Fifth Book; and it therefore does not require much notice here. But it may be well to speak of the view which Hooker takes of the nature and use of ceremonies, and of what that view suggests concerning their place in Christian worship. They are the outward fashion in which great public duties are

<sup>1</sup> VII. v. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's Hooker: Editor's Preface, §§ 39-41.

done; not the substance of these duties, but their becoming accessories and circumstances, serving either to teach or to move men's hearts. The general principle of using ceremonies seems to be drawn from the law of nature, since no nation lets great public actions, civil or sacred, pass without some visible solemnity. Nor are ceremonies to be regarded as a mere garnishing of religious acts, a mere pomp externally and arbitrarily tacked on to them. If ceremonies are as they should be, they are "resemblances framed according to things spiritually understood, whereunto they serve as a hand to lead, and a way to direct<sup>1</sup>." Thus it appears that in using them religion is availing itself of the aptness of things visible to show forth things spiritual: such aptness as our Lord laid hold on and disclosed in His teaching by parables: such aptness as seems to be constantly presumed in the language of the Fathers<sup>2</sup>. Of ceremonies thus significant "some are Sacraments, some as Sacraments only. Sacraments are those which are signs and tokens of some general promised grace, which always really descendeth from God unto the soul that duly receiveth them; other significant tokens are only as Sacraments, yet no Sacraments<sup>3</sup>." Thus, while Sacraments have their distinctive note and place and power, the sacramental principle, the principle which in the light and strength of the Incarnation hallows things visible for the service of the invisible and recognizes in its fullness the complex nature of man, seems to have also a subordinate expression in the ceremonies of the Church.

It is interesting to notice Hooker's clear and steady sense of the independence of the Church of England, both in regard to the Church of Rome and in regard to the reformed Churches of the Continent. In regard to the Church of Rome, it does not at all matter to him if the Church of England uses some ceremonies in common with it; for the Church of England, as a continuous part of the ancient Church, has the same proper and independent right to those ceremonies which the Church of Rome has. The Church of England has no need, no reason either to shun or to seek things because Rome uses them; for it has its own right to all that is Catholic and historic. "The ceremonies which we have taken

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Hooker from Dionys. de Eccl. Hierarch. 2. 3. 2. Τὰ μὲν αἰσθητῶς ἱερὰ τῶν νοητῶν ἀπεικονίσματα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὰ χειραγωγία καὶ ὁδός. Cf.

V. vi. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's Preface to Hooker, §§ 48, 49, 50.

<sup>3</sup> IV. 1. 4.

"from such as were before us, are not things that belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, "from whom the same are descended unto us"<sup>1</sup>. And similarly in regard to the reformed Churches abroad, it does not at all matter to Hooker if the Church of England differs from them in retaining ceremonies which they have discarded<sup>2</sup>. The Church of England has taken its own course in reformation: a course more moderate than that extreme and rigorous method which has elsewhere been adopted; a course which recognizes the danger of deep and wide unsettlement attendant on the changing of laws, and the duty of proceeding warily even where the necessity of change is proved; a course which Hooker has no wish at all to bend into conformity with foreign ways. Rather he sees in the more calm and temperate reformation of the Church of England an especial sign of God's guiding and restraining hand; and in the grace which, notwithstanding all the sins and transgressions of English Churchmen, has so strangely brought the English Church through all the perils that beset it, he reads an evidence of God's constant presence and of the Church's right to allegiance for His Name's sake<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> IV. ix. 1. Cf. V. xxviii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> IV. xiii. 1, 8, 9.

<sup>3</sup> IV. xiv. 6, 1, 7. It is interesting to compare with Hooker's Fourth Book, William Perkins' Reformed

Catholike, a careful and not intemperate book which was published in 1597, the year of Hooker's Fifth Book. Cf. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, ii. 473-475.

## CHAPTER V.

### *The Fifth Book.*

THE relation of the first four books to the work which was to follow them is indicated by Hooker himself in an "Advertise-ment to the Reader," printed at the end of Book IV in the first and second editions<sup>1</sup>. "I have for some causes (gentle Reader) thought it at this time more fit to let goe these first foure bookes by themselves, then to stay both them and the rest, till the whole might together be published. Such generalities of the cause in question as here are handled, it will be perhaps not amisse to consider apart, as by way of introduction unto the bookes that are to followe concerning particulars." Hitherto he has been concerned with the general assertions of the Puritans, the axioms by which they would have the controversy ruled and settled; and over against their claims he has maintained the general principles which he believes to be valid in the sphere of ecclesiastical polity. In the Fifth Book he comes to deal with an assertion which concerns particular points, and must be met not with a general answer but at point after point—the assertion "that touching the several public duties of Christian Religion, there is amongst us much superstition retained in them; and concerning persons which for performance of those duties are indued with the power of ecclesiastical order, our laws and proceedings according thereunto are many ways herein also corrupt." The difference in the nature of the attack accounts for the difference in the character of some parts of the book; it is not altogether Hooker's fault if in meeting criticisms which are

<sup>1</sup> The reprinting of this note (with a different set of *Errata* after it) in the second edition is curious, since Books I-IV of that edition bear date

1604, seven years after the publication of Book V, and four years after Hooker's death.

sometimes captious and trivial he sometimes is tedious and cold. Where the matter gives him scope he rises to the level of his highest and most enduring work.

In the Epistle Dedicatorie addressed to Archbishop Whitgift (whose signature authorizes the press manuscript of the book, now in the Bodleian Library<sup>1</sup>), Hooker, after speaking of the reasons, personal and general, which led him to offer his work for the Archbishop's acceptance, goes on to mark the prevalent misdirection of men's zeal for reformation (since it is not the case that "good laws have so much been wanting unto us, as we to "them"), and the nature of the controversies which have thus sprung up concerning "complements, rites, and ceremonies of "Church actions": controversies which, being for the most part unimportant in themselves<sup>2</sup>, are nevertheless in their tendencies peculiarly and manifoldly perilous, and in their actual outcome have proved widely harmful, exciting in some men fanaticism<sup>3</sup>, in others malice and scurrility, and affording opportunity to the covetousness and corruption of others. The Epistle closes with a fine delineation of a Christian's duty in such days:—unselfish wisdom, tempered with meekness; diligent study, to "anatomize every particle of that body, which we are to uphold sound"; vigilance, to prevent those personal evils and misdoings "whereby "the hearts of men are lost"; constancy in labour and in prayer for all men.

There is, in the Epistle Dedicatorie, one phrase which needs special notice, as bearing on the method which Hooker proposes for the work on which he is entering. He speaks of having "thought it convenient to wade thorough the whole cause, follow-  
"ing that method which searcheth the truth by the causes of truth<sup>4</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. App. V. p. 258, and the notice of the MS. prefixed to Book V.

<sup>2</sup> In this and in another passage of the Epistle Hooker's language seems to suggest, at least, that he had seen Bacon's very remarkable Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church of England. The paper was not printed till 1640, but it was written in 1589 or 1590, while Hooker was still at the Temple; and Mr. Spedding says in regard to it, "I do not know what "use Bacon made of this paper, but

"I can hardly doubt that he showed "it to Burghley and Walsingham." Bancroft certainly had seen it when he wrote the Survey in 1593. Cf. Spedding's Life and Letters, i. 73, 75; R. W. Church, Bacon, pp. 14-19; Bacon, Resuscitatio, pp. 129 seq.

<sup>3</sup> The story of the conspiracy to which Hooker here alludes as an illustration of the fanaticism that was astir is so curious that it has seemed worth while to tell it in App. VI.

<sup>4</sup> Epistle Dedicatorie, § 3.

The expression is not quite clear, but it seems to mean that Hooker adopted for his work, not the method which is directed merely to the confutation of an opponent, nor the method which moves on the surface of disputed matters, merely appealing to authority or general consent, but the deeper, surer way which penetrates to principles, and shows what are those ultimate laws, those *ὁρισμοὶ ἀναπόδεικτοι* (in regard to the nature of man, and God's dealings with him, and his relation to God and to his fellow-men), which make it impossible that the truth concerning the various matters brought under consideration should be other than it is. It is possible that Hooker had in his mind Ar. *Analyt. Post. I. ii. 1*. Ἐπίστασθαι δὲ οἰόμεθα ἕκαστον ἀπλῶς (ἀλλὰ μὴ τὸν σοφιστικὸν τρόπον τὸν κατὰ συμβεβηκός), ὅταν τήν τ' αἰτίαν οἰώμεθα γινώσκειν, δι' ἣν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐστίν, ὅτι ἐκείνου αἰτία ἐστίν, καὶ μὴ ἐνδέχεσθαι τοῦτ' ἄλλως ἔχειν. Cf. *Ibid. II. ix. 1, 2*<sup>1</sup>. Hooker seems in *I. viii. 2* to forego this "most sure and infallible way," and to choose that "which, being the worse in itself, is notwithstanding now by reason of common imbecility the fitter and "likelier to be brooked": but the subject of his search is there somewhat different. A good instance of the method he here chooses may be seen in *V. lxix*.

THE attempt of this Introduction is to help the reader to approach Hooker's Fifth Book with such knowledge of its conditions, its preliminaries, its aims as may contribute to the understanding and appreciation of its contents:—to place the reader—if the phrase be not presumptuous—in the likeliest attitude of mind for entrance into the Book. It would therefore be out of place to give a full account of the Fifth Book itself, even if it were possible, as the present writer has not found it, to condense such an account within tolerable limits; an analysis of Hooker's heavily-charged paragraphs effecting little elucidation with any abridgement, or indeed without some expansion. All, therefore, that will be here essayed is such a general account of the successive parts of the Book as may make somewhat easier the apprehension of their drift and coherence.

<sup>1</sup> For the suggestion of these references I am indebted to the Rev. T. B. Strong.

*BOOK V.—A. Chapters i-iv.*

In the first four chapters Hooker's main purpose is characteristic and congenial. For he is trying to get at the real meaning of the charge with which he has to deal. The Puritans assert, he says, "that touching the several public duties of religion, there is amongst us much superstition retained in them." What then is superstition?

Hooker approaches the answer to this question indirectly. He holds that superstition stands in regard to true religion as an extreme or excess on one side, contrary to atheism as the extreme or defect on the other side. He therefore, by way of showing what superstition is, considers first what atheism is. But the most important type of atheism in his day was that which, connecting itself justly or unjustly with the name of Macchiavelli, maintained the importance of religion as an implement of government, and denied that it had any other warrant or ground of existence: regarding it as a convenient body of fiction which rulers did well to keep up and encourage, even by fraudulent means. This gross, demoralizing unbelief holds within it one streak of truth. There is a politic use of religion: it is the stay of states: it has a force "to qualify all sorts of men, and to "make them in public affairs the more serviceable": and accordingly Hooker speaks first of this public value of religion: dwelling on it both because it is a conviction which he and the Puritans can share, "that pure and unstained religion ought to be "the highest of all cares appertaining to public regiment": and because he can thus show clearly the truth which Macchiavelli had made it easy to distort into a thesis for atheists. Of their general position he next speaks: and from it passes on to the contrary excess, the departure from true religion in the contrary direction, the fault of superstition, evinced "when things are "either abhorred or observed with a zealous or fearful, but "erroneous relation to God."

It is easy to criticize a line of thought which looks like holding that superstition is only too much of the good thing, religion, of which atheism is too little. But this is not what Hooker really means or says: and rightly understood he teaches a truth of

great importance in regard to the controversy he had in hand, and of lasting value. Superstition is an exuberance or efflorescence of man's faculty of religion: but it is an exuberance misdirected or set running to waste by man's ignorance or folly or wilfulness or vice. There is obvious ~~truth~~ truth in Hooker's "parable from nature": "In the Church of God sometimes it cometh to pass "as in over battle<sup>1</sup> grounds, the fertile disposition whereof is good; "yet because it exceedeth due proportion, it bringeth forth "abundantly, through too much rankness, things less profitable; "whereby that which principally it should yield, being either pre-vented in place, or defrauded of nourishment, faileth<sup>2</sup>." But perhaps a more complete analogy to the growth of superstition might be found in those malformations of trees or maladies of the human body which are due to the arrest and perversion of the processes of growth; when the forces which should serve for the repair and developement of the organism are misdirected and thrown into increasing deformity, into disease and death. The function of the religious faculty is to order and nourish and strengthen the whole life and being of man for the loving service of God and the happiness of communion with Him. When a man declines from that aim through ignorance or sloth or lack of spirituality or love of sin; when he tries to come to terms with evil, and to hold on to religion without making the sacrifice or the effort it demands, he is apt to incline towards superstition: to endeavour to satisfy his own sense of the divine requirement by something else than that which is required: to seek expression for the religious faculty elsewhere than in the knowledge and the love of God: to evade the immeasurable demand of holiness by proffering what God has never required and will never accept: to multiply devotions instead of advancing in devotion and doing justly and loving mercy and walking humbly with God. It is this misdirected and irregular activity of the faculty for religion that engenders superstition: and it is substantially a just account that Hooker gives of that grave and perilous fault which formed the main part of the Puritan indictment against the outward order and ceremonial of the Church of England.

<sup>1</sup> I. e. fruitful, fertile.

<sup>2</sup> V. iii. 4.

Rank growth  
cf.  
malformation  
and death

*B. Chapters v-x.*

In the next six chapters Hooker proposes and explains four axioms or general principles, to which appeal may be made when the propriety of an established rite or custom is brought into question.

It is important to mark clearly the place and use of these axioms. They are of force only "where the Word of God "leaveth the Church to make choice of her own ordinances"<sup>1</sup>: they cannot be invoked where the rule of Scripture is express and clear. Further, they are subordinate to rules established by necessary and demonstrative reasoning: they cannot be invoked against "that which men either by the direct discernment of "clear and manifest principles, or by necessary inference from "such principles so discerned, have, with the help of God, "rightly found out themselves to be all for ever bound unto "in their actions"<sup>2</sup>." They hold good, therefore, only in the territory where Human Laws "take place." And yet further, within this territory Hooker would limit their force by insisting on a due deference to "notable public inconvenience": they cannot be set aside for "some few, rare, casual, and tolerable, or other-"wise curable inconveniences": but they cannot be invoked where the detriment they would involve to the general welfare is plain and great. But with these reservations they have power to inculcate obedience, notwithstanding individual opinion or preference, and to outweigh "any bare and naked conceit to the "contrary."

The four axioms are clearly set forward and explained. They are (i) that reverence may be claimed for those religious ceremonies or observances which are "effectual and generally fit to "set forward godliness": i.e. for those which reason can recognise as appropriate, with reference to the subject from which they proceed, the Church of God:—the Object with which they are conversant, Almighty God, Who requires the utmost which true affection can yield:—the character of the religious life:—or the hope that is set before the Church, the hidden, hoped-for glory of the Church triumphant.

<sup>1</sup> V. x. I.<sup>2</sup> Cf. *supra*, Synopsis of Bk. I; and Bk. I. viii. 11, 8.

(ii) That a like claim may be made for ceremonies or observances which are commended by "the judgement of antiquity, "and by the long-continued practice of the whole Church."

1 Antiquity  
and long  
continued  
practice

(iii) That a like claim may also be made for ceremonies or observances appointed by the authority of the Church, though they be but newly instituted:—because "all things cannot be of "ancient continuance, which are expedient and needful for the "ordering of spiritual affairs: but the Church being a body which "dieth not hath always power, as occasion requireth, no less to "ordain that which never was, than to ratify what hath been "before <sup>1</sup>."

(3)  
Ceremonies  
newly  
constituted  
by  
authority  
of the  
Church

(iv) That for the practising of general laws according to their right meaning it is requisite that they should sometimes be adapted to particular necessities: and that therefore there should be some duly constituted authority empowered to grant dispensation from the requirement of a general law, where such dispensation is demanded by clear necessity or the public utility.

(4)  
Adaptation  
particular  
necessities

In the tenth chapter, as in a postscript to his enunciation of these four axioms, these four claims for deference and submission, Hooker anticipates a ground on which their authority was likely to be resisted. A man might contend that in spite of them all he was bound to follow what he held that God's Spirit had revealed to him personally, or to some other man of whom he thought highly. Hooker's answer is characteristic and of lasting importance. Men ought very seriously to suspect the source and soundness of a conviction which God does not give them power to commend to others either by miracle or by demonstration. There is "a strong presumption, that God hath not moved their "hearts to think such things as He hath not enabled them to "prove." For all the workings of God's Spirit are for peace: whereas nothing but confusion could come of the unchecked and uncontrolled assertion of individual and solitary revelations<sup>2</sup>.

Few parts of Hooker's treatise will reward close study better than the six chapters which have just been considered. They may seem at first to enunciate great claims somewhat abruptly, with scarcely such fullness of exposition and defence as their greatness needs. But in truth the adequate presentation and developement of the first three axioms, which are far more

<sup>1</sup> V. viii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. VII. xiv. 11.

important than the fourth, is to be found in the earlier Books of the treatise. Though Hooker seems to argue here for each axiom as he enunciates it, it is there that he has displayed the ample strength, the impregnable integrity of those great facts and principles of human life which make him really sure of his axioms: the force and dignity of reason, the weight of human authority and tradition, the legislative power committed by Almighty God to the Church as a spiritual society, the distinction between matters of faith and matters of polity, the use of ceremonies. He does not indeed refer to the preceding Books in these chapters of the Fifth, but he would have written differently had not the language he uses and the principles he declares been already before his readers. Much that in the earlier Books is fully set forth, as a part of his great philosophy of Law, is here condensed or implied in a few exact and pregnant sentences: and other characteristic elements of his system are here brought forward with lucidity and precision:—for instance, his conception of the principles involved in dispensation, displayed in the ninth chapter: a conception which receives further treatment in the eighty-first.

### *C. Chapters xi–xvii.*

The first ten chapters of the Book have been preliminary to its main task, to which Hooker now addresses himself: meeting in the first place the Puritan attack on the practice of the Church in regard to places for public worship. With the several points of this attack he is concerned in the seven chapters now to be briefly considered: enunciating first the general principle underlying the practice of the Church, and showing it to be a principle recognized in every age of religion: and then defending the “solemnities usual at the first erection of churches”; the designation of churches by the names of saints and angels: the distinction between the body of the church and the chancel<sup>1</sup>;

<sup>1</sup> In *A Viewe of Antichrist*, by Antony Gilby, one of the “hundred pointes of poperie, remayning, which deforme the Englishe reformation” is “the Quier or Cage

“wherein they do separate themselves from the congregation, and cause the worde not to be understoode of the people.”—*A Parte of a Register*, p. 60.

the beauty and stateliness of churches ; the holiness and virtue ascribed to churches ; the maintenance and use of churches which in the past had been used for superstitious worship<sup>1</sup>.

It is mainly on the grounds of intrinsic reasonableness and of ancient and continuous tradition that Hooker takes his stand in these chapters. There are in them passages in which some of his characteristic thoughts appear with force and beauty : and there are other passages in which he seems to be using less than his full strength, as though he found it hard to think that the assault needed or deserved much trouble. But in dealing with "their pretence "that would have churches utterly razed" he argues strenuously : probably because Barrowe had laid stress on this point in the treatise already referred to, and because it was a point at which distinctive and far-reaching fallacies of Puritanism were vigorously evinced. It would indeed have been the major premiss for some widely ruinous conclusions if it could have been successfully contended that everything whereon or wherewith superstition had worked was to be utterly destroyed. The main ground of that contention lay in the requirements of the Old Testament concerning places where idols had been worshipped : these requirements being transferred without qualification to the conditions of the sixteenth century and the relation between the Reformed Church and the Mediaeval. In meeting this argument Hooker first clears himself of all appearance of tenderness towards idolatry, "the highest degree of treason against the Supreme "Guide and Monarch of the whole world"; and then clears the question of a confusion which panic and passion had imported into it ;—the idea of wreaking punishment on the material things which superstition had abused. Where there is no understanding there is no will : where there is no will there is no sin : where there is no sin there can be no punishment. "There may be "cause sometimes to abolish" irrational things : "but surely "never by way of punishment to the things themselves."—The analogous cases or examples drawn from the Old Testament Hooker meets by insisting on the distinction which he defined

<sup>1</sup> The duty of utterly destroying the buildings which had been used for "idolatrous" worship is strenuously and elaborately urged in ch.

xix. of *A Brief Discovery of the False Churches*, by Henry Barrowe : reprinted, London 1707.

and maintained in the First Book : the great distinction between laws permanent and laws mutable. When the Israelites were commanded to make no covenant with the Canaanites or to destroy all places where the Canaanites had served their gods, or when Saul was commanded utterly to destroy the Amalekites and their cattle, these commandments were of the nature of laws positive and mutable, having regard to particular conditions : apart from those conditions the commandments are inapplicable and invalid. And incidentally Hooker's view of the English Reformation is presented plainly, and in accordance with his language in the Fourth Book :—"It is reason we should likewise "consider how great a difference there is between their proceedings, who erect a new commonwealth, which is to have "neither people nor law, neither regiment nor religion, the same "that was; and theirs who only reform a decayed estate by "reducing it to that perfection from which it hath swerved. In "this case we are to retain as much, in the other as little, of "former things as we may<sup>1</sup>."

#### D. *Chapters xviii-xxii.*

From the consideration of places set apart for the service of God, Hooker goes on to speak of their use; and first of the communication of that knowledge of God which is "the very ground "of all our happiness, and the seed of whatsoever perfect virtue groweth from us<sup>2</sup>,"

On no defect in the state of the Church did the Puritans insist with more justice than on the lack of preaching, and the wrong done to the people by clergy who were non-resident or unlearned. The fault was due in part to the disadvantage of the Church after Mary's reign, in part to the plunder of Church property, with the consequence of an untrained and ignorant ministry<sup>3</sup>. But in justice to those who were impatient and indignant at the scandalous deficiency of preachers it must be remembered that when Hooker began his treatise this lack had gone on for nearly thirty years, amended indeed, but very incompletely: so that

<sup>1</sup> V. xvii. 5. Cf. IV. viii, xiv.

<sup>2</sup> V. xviii. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Hardwick, *Church History, Reformation*, p. 378 and note 2.

a whole generation had grown up seeing parishes neglected and the poor untaught. It is easy to laugh at the Puritan exaltation of sermons, at their vehement denunciation of an unpreaching ministry: but it is unjust to forget the greatness and the persistence of the neglect which they denounced. There is no need to cite the strong language of controversy: figures and formal documents show plainly enough from time to time the strength of their case. In 1561 Archbishop Parker made an enquiry into the state of the parishes in his province; and Strype, taking as an instance (likely to be a favourable instance) the Archdeaconry of London, records that some of the ministers held three, some four, and one five livings together: that one "was Vicar of St. Dunstan's West, and had Whiston and Doncaster in Yorkshire, Rugby in Warwickshire, and Barnet in Middlesex: that few or none of the Curates were graduates: that many of the Vicars, nay, and Parsons, were non-graduates: that not above a third of them were Preachers: that as for their Learning, thus it was commonly set down: *Latinè aliquot verba intelligit. Latinè utcunque intelligit. Latinè pauca intelligit*<sup>1</sup>, &c." The standard of learning is curiously illustrated by a letter which Strype gives from the Curate of Cripplegate to the Archbishop's Chaplain<sup>2</sup> ("*scriptus te viginti quinque die Mensis Junus*"): and by the examination of a dunce who, holding already one living, quarrelled with the Bishop of Norwich for refusing to institute him to a second<sup>3</sup>. Again in 1576 it is the ignorance of the clergy and the great need of "more frequent Preaching for the Instruction of the People in grounds and truth of Religion," that moves Archbishop Grindal to be zealous for the Prophesyings<sup>4</sup>: and in the Preface to the English translation of Bullinger's *Decades*, published in 1577, the work is described as intended to meet the needs of those ministers who lacking knowledge, or having knowledge but lacking "order, discretion, memory, or audacity, cannot by reason of their wants, either expound, or exhort, or otherwise preach, but only read the order of service"<sup>5</sup>. Nine years later, in 1586, the Puritans made a survey of the parishes with regard to the residence, character, learning, and preaching of the clergy:

<sup>1</sup> Life of Parker, Bk. ii. ch. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. App. No. XX.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. Bk. iv. ch. 7. Cf. Life of Grindal, Bk. ii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Strype's Life of Grindal, ii. 8. Cf. App. No. IX.

<sup>5</sup> Bullinger's *Decades*, vol. i. p. 8 (Parker Society).

and according to their reckoning there were in the 160 parishes of Cornwall only 29 preachers, in the 210 of Buckinghamshire only 30, in the 335 of Essex only 12: and altogether in 10,000 parish-churches only 2,000<sup>1</sup>. But perhaps the most significant evidence in the matter comes from the Orders introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the Convocation of 1586, requiring that those ministers who are not licensed to preach shall get a Bible and Bullinger's Decades, and read over one chapter of the Bible every day and one sermon of Bullinger's every week and "note the principal contents thereof briefly in his "paper booke" and submit them to an examiner: that every licensed preacher shall preach at least twelve sermons in the course of the year: and that an arrangement shall be made by which each parish shall hear at least one sermon a quarter<sup>2</sup>. It must have been a low level on which this was the highest standard that could be raised—and that in the twenty-eighth year of Elizabeth's reign.

The Puritans had, then, a strong case at this point, and they were not likely to be backward in urging it. There is earnestness as well as vehemence in two documents which appeared about the date of Hooker's work, The lamentable Complaint of the Commonaltie, by way of Supplication, to the high Court of Parliament for a learned Ministerie, and The humble petition of the Communalitie to their most renowned and gracious Sovereigne, the Ladie Elizabeth<sup>3</sup>. "So many congregations of us as be in this land, destitute of a godly minister, to preach unto us the Word of Salvation (as there be exceeding many) do intreat for our life, and the life of our neighbours. For we are sure to be destroyed, to be slain, and to perish eternally, if by your gracious help, speedy remedy be not had." . . . "We desire that our Pastor teach us the Worde of God truly and sincerely, the which sincere affection moveth him that is endued therewith, in his whole ministry to seek the glory of God, and the saving of the souls of the people committed to his charge." "We desire to be taught this doctrine of salvation in all simplicity and plainness: which plainness no doubt springeth from sincerity,

<sup>1</sup> Neal's History of the Puritans, i. 415-417.

<sup>2</sup> Cardwell's Synodalia, ii. 562, 564.

<sup>3</sup> Both documents are reprinted in the rare and valuable volume entitled *A Parte of a Register*.

“as from the fountain. For he that seeketh God’s glory, and the conversion of sinners, will make choice of the means that may best bring his desire and purpose to effect, which is a plain and familiar handling of the Word of God, as we have our Saviour Christ and His Apostles for Example.” “To this sincerity and plainness in teaching, there ought to be joined a continuance in the holy exercise of the Word.” . . . “But if further reply be made of those that tender our salvation, but a little, saying, ‘You are sufficiently provided of preaching by your quarterly sermons, we answer, that four sermons in the year are as insufficient ordinarily, to make us perfect men in Christ Jesus (to which end Pastors and Doctors are given us) as four strokes with an axe are unable to fell down a mighty oak, or four showers of rain of one hour’s continuance, to moisten the hard dry earth, and to make it fruitful all the year long<sup>1</sup>.’ . . . ‘So it is, most dread Sovereign, that the greatest part of the people of the land, are altogether blind and ignorant of true religion: yea, more ignorant than is credible to any, that hath made no trial of us, as though we had never dwelt within the lists of Christendom.’ ‘But we pray your highness most humbly upon our knees that for the redress of this our woeful case, you would not send us to the Bishops of this land, or commit this charge of establishing of an holy ministry unto their fidelity. For if they should solemnly promise your Majesty, and that with an oath, that they would have special care of this matter, yet we could not be induced to believe that they would perform it, neither could we conceive any comfort by such words. Because that by the space of this nine and twenty years, their unfaithfulness hath manifestly appeared, in that they having power, have not provided for us themselves, no not so much as law requireth, neither at any time sought means either in Court or Council that ever we could learn, to satisfy our hungry souls with bread.”

It was a real and serious complaint:—“the hungry sheep look up and are not fed”:—and for the space of a whole generation

<sup>1</sup> Appended to The lamentable Complaint (anno 1586) is a very curious note (1) citing an illustration of the complaint in the Parish of

Darfield, and (2) diverging to an agrarian grievance, and pleading for the restitution of cottage-gardens or allotments.

the destitution had gone on: men had passed from youth beyond middle age and seen the Church neglecting in thousands of parishes one great part of the divine commission: seen moreover the Prophesyings, which might have done something to mend matters, suppressed rigorously, in spite of the Archbishop's protest: and seen also some of those who were eager and seemed able to do the neglected work refused the liberty to do it, or, as Travers was, inhibited in the course of it. It was natural that men should speak strongly as they saw the multitudes left almost untaught: it was not strange if in speaking strongly they said some things that were rash and indefensible. So Cartwright said that "prayers and Sacraments forasmuch as they take effect "by the preaching of the Word, where that is not, those do not "only not feed, but are ordinarily to further condemnation<sup>1</sup>": "no salvation to be looked for, where is no preaching<sup>2</sup>": "unless "the Lord work miraculously and extraordinarily (which is not "to be looked for of us) the bare reading of the Scriptures without "the preaching cannot deliver so much as one poor sheep from "destruction and from the wolf<sup>3</sup>": and, "further I say that if "there be any such as being able to preach for his knowledge, yet "for fault either of utterance or memory cannot do it but by "reading that which he hath written; it is not convenient that "he should be a minister in the Church. For St. Paul doth not "require only that the Bishop or Minister should be learned in the "mysteries of the Gospel and such a one as is able to set down "in writing in his study the sense of the Scripture, but one which "is apt and fit to teach. And the Prophet Malachi sheweth that "he must have the law not in his papers but in his lips<sup>4</sup>." Thus indignation at the neglect of preaching ran over into a denial of saving efficacy in other ordinances where preaching was not: into a cruel discouragement of those who lacked the help of sermons: into a belief that there was no preaching save "without "book": into a disparagement, excessive though not unreserved<sup>5</sup>, of the systematic reading of Scripture: into a complete exclusion of the reading of the Apocrypha and of Homilies<sup>6</sup>. For the Puritans, like many other people, when they could not have what

<sup>1</sup> Second Replie, p. 364.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 380.

<sup>3</sup> Id. A Replye, p. 216.

<sup>4</sup> Id. *ibid.* p. 160.

<sup>5</sup> Second Replie, p. 373.

<sup>6</sup> A Replye, pp. 196-198.

Hooker does not appear to be dealing with this point. Perhaps he slipped into that form of intolerance which is the danger of an accurate mind:—exaggeration was repulsive to him, and made him indignant<sup>1</sup>:—and so he did less than justice to the rightful strength of the case that was overstated. In a later chapter<sup>2</sup> he does indeed speak plainly about the abuses and scandals to which the Puritans could point: but here he weakens his position by making no adequate confession of the gravity of the long neglect of preaching. He fastens on the exaggerated language of his opponents, and he has little difficulty in proving it erroneous: he meets somewhat unsatisfactorily certain criticisms on the fidelity of the Church in preserving the exact meaning of the Scriptures: and he defends the Apocryphal Books against the sweeping censure of the Puritans. But the main part of his argument is directed to vindicating a wide application for the word *Preaching*. The Puritans had probably come to think too confidently and narrowly that there was no preaching at all save the utterance of unwritten sermons: with still less warrant they were inclined to apply to such sermons all that was said about the Word of God: and so they had brought people to think with extravagant expectancy of that way of teaching, and with comparative contempt of all other ways. There was therefore a real error in men's minds to be corrected: they had come to look for the disclosure of divine truth, the ministry of the Word, by one channel only, whereas there were many by which they might receive it: and so Hooker is dealing with an actual and serious misconception when he argues that "Sermons are not the only preaching which doth save souls," since "preaching is a general end whereunto writing and speaking do both serve." Within this wide sense of preaching he could bring catechizing, the reading of the Canonical Scriptures, and the reading of the Apocryphal Books and of Homilies: and he could rightly contend that there was a good hope that those who were taught by these means might both "come to apprehend the mysteries of God" and also yield to the Gospel of Christ their "unfeigned assent as to a thing infallibly true<sup>3</sup>," even though they were left without

they rightly wanted, were not inclined to make the best of what they might have.

Hooker does not appear at his best in dealing with this point. Perhaps he slipped into that form of intolerance which is the danger of an accurate mind:—exaggeration was repulsive to him, and made him indignant<sup>1</sup>:—and so he did less than justice to the rightful strength of the case that was overstated. In a later chapter<sup>2</sup> he does indeed speak plainly about the abuses and scandals to which the Puritans could point: but here he weakens his position by making no adequate confession of the gravity of the long neglect of preaching. He fastens on the exaggerated language of his opponents, and he has little difficulty in proving it erroneous: he meets somewhat unsatisfactorily certain criticisms on the fidelity of the Church in preserving the exact meaning of the Scriptures: and he defends the Apocryphal Books against the sweeping censure of the Puritans. But the main part of his argument is directed to vindicating a wide application for the word *Preaching*. The Puritans had probably come to think too confidently and narrowly that there was no preaching at all save the utterance of unwritten sermons: with still less warrant they were inclined to apply to such sermons all that was said about the Word of God: and so they had brought people to think with extravagant expectancy of that way of teaching, and with comparative contempt of all other ways. There was therefore a real error in men's minds to be corrected: they had come to look for the disclosure of divine truth, the ministry of the Word, by one channel only, whereas there were many by which they might receive it: and so Hooker is dealing with an actual and serious misconception when he argues that "Sermons are not the only preaching which doth save souls," since "preaching is a general end whereunto writing and speaking do both serve." Within this wide sense of preaching he could bring catechizing, the reading of the Canonical Scriptures, and the reading of the Apocryphal Books and of Homilies: and he could rightly contend that there was a good hope that those who were taught by these means might both "come to apprehend the mysteries of God" and also yield to the Gospel of Christ their "unfeigned assent as to a thing infallibly true<sup>3</sup>," even though they were left without

<sup>1</sup> V. xxii. 17.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxxxi. 1, 2. Cf. VII. xxiv. 7.

<sup>3</sup> V. xxii. 8.

the help of sermons. It was timely and necessary to insist on this as against the exaggerated estimation of sermons which was laying hold of men's minds, and withdrawing their attention and hope from all other avenues of light: and Hooker's arguments are strong and serviceable. But one cannot help feeling that it would have been better to recognize more thoroughly the shameful wrong that non-residence and ignorance were doing in depriving the greater part (to say the least) of the parishes of England of that which is for simple people the likeliest way of teaching in the faith: to put in the forefront of all that was to be said about the "open publication of heavenly mysteries" and "the instruction of all sorts of men to eternal life" a full avowal of the failure of the Church (hindered by those who plundered its endowments and betrayed its trust) to rise to the height of its calling and opportunity in this regard: and then to plead for patience while matters were being mended and for hopefulness that God would bless what could be done meanwhile. Hooker's skilful proof that lessons and homilies may do to a great extent what the Puritans ascribed exclusively to sermons would surely have seemed more admirable and more appropriate if its purpose had been somewhat thus restricted.

#### *E. Chapters xxiii-xlix.*

In approaching the objections alleged by the Puritans against the Book of Common Prayer, Hooker, after his frequent custom, begins by setting forth, in its depth and height, the true conception of the act of Prayer: the act correlative to God's disclosure of His truth, in the continual intercourse between heaven and earth. It is an act into which men enter in two ways: as individuals, and as members of "that visible mystical "body which is His Church." To this second way are attached helps which cannot otherwise be enjoyed: the help of that power and beauty and dignity which are in God's Sanctuary: the help of God's ministers, "ordained to procure by their prayers His "love and favour towards all": the still greater help of a set and standing order of Common Prayer, preserved to the Church by the singular care and providence of God, and protecting the

congregation from "the irksome deformities whereby through  
"endless and senseless effusions of indigested prayers they  
"oftentimes disgrace in most insufferable manner the worthiest  
"part of Christian duty towards God, who herein are subject to  
"no certain order, but pray both what and how they list."

With regard to the use of any prescribed form of Common Prayer, the mind of the Puritans does not seem to have been quite settled and uniform. In the First Admonition it is alleged that in the early Church "Ministers were not so tied to any one  
"form of prayers, but as the Spirit moved them, and as necessity  
"of time required, so they might pour forth hearty supplications  
"to the Lord: now they are bound of necessity to a prescript  
"order of Service, and Book of Common Prayer, in which a great  
"number of things contrary to God's Word are contained." In the Second Admonition it is said of the Book of Common Prayer, "if it were praying, and that there were never an ill word nor  
"sentence in all the prayers, yet to appoint it to be used, or so to  
"use it as Papists did their Mattins and Evensong, for a set  
"service to God, though the words be good, the use is naught." Accordingly Whitgift in his Answer to the Admonition<sup>1</sup> is careful to deal with this point, arguing for the rightfulness of a prescribed form. But in "Certain Articles Collected and taken  
"(as it is thought) by the Byshops out of a litle booke entituled an  
"Admonition to the Parliament," indignation is expressed at the suspicion that "they will not have the ministers tyed (as they  
"terme it) to any fourme of prayers invented by man." This is said to be "utterly falsified. There is no such thing meant, that  
"there should be none at al, but that this of theirs ought not to  
"be tollerated. A fourme of prayers they deny not. Nay we do  
"use one in oure congregations, and the same that all reformed  
"Churches do."

Accordingly Cartwright in his Reply says, "The authors of  
"the Admonition declare that their meaning is not to disallow of  
"prescript service of prayer, but of this form that we have": and again, "Forasmuch as we agree of a prescript form of prayer to  
"be used in the Church, let that go." Whitgift therefore in his Defence of the Answer to the Admonition writes, "Forasmuch as  
"in this point you consent with me, and grant that there may be

<sup>1</sup> Pp. 77, 78.

"a prescript form of prayer, I will omit whatsoever I had proposed to have said more in that matter." And similarly Hooker deals but very briefly with the objection against a set form of Prayer, and speaks of the Admonitioners as having retracted their first opinion on the subject.

It may be doubted, however, whether the agreement which was professed would have proved itself in practice satisfactory. For in the Form of Common Prayer used by the English at Geneva, and in the Book of the Form of Common Prayer tendered to the Parliament in 1587, there are rubrics such as Hooker quotes in V. xxviii. 2; rubrics which show that the prayers prescribed in the Form need not be regarded as necessarily to be used just as they stood, but rather as indicating the sort of prayer which the Minister was to make at that point in the Service: he was to give thanks, to pray, to bless "in this manner, or such-like": "either in these words following, or like in effect": "in this or such-like sort." And similarly in the proposed Act for the establishing of the Book tendered to the Parliament, as given in the Copy of the Second Part of a Register, a manuscript in the Morrice Collection in Dr. Williams' Library, it is provided that "if the Minister of any Parish shall at any time besides the prayers of the said Booke, make prayers or give thanks in the Public Assembly, so the same be not contrary to the Confession of faith annexed to the beginning of the same Book, it shall be lawful for him so to do." It seems likely that in actual use the prescript form would have been freely dealt with, and proved no adequate safeguard against the "effusions of indigested prayers" which Hooker feared. But the apparent agreement on the general principle of a set form of Common Prayer diverted the controversy for a while from that topic to the criticism of details in the English Liturgy: and it is mainly with the defence of such details that Hooker is next concerned.

At the outset of this part of his work he meets a Censure closely akin to the subject of the Fourth Book. It was a taunt often heard from the Puritans that the Prayer Book was largely drawn from the Service Books of the Mediaeval Church: so the Admonitioners say that it is "culled and picked out of that popishe dunghil, the Portuise and Masse Boke, full of all

"abominations": and that "their pontificall . . . is nothing else "but a thing woorde for woorde drawne out of the Pope's "pontifycal, wherein he sheweth himselfe to be Antichrist most "lively": with much more in the same tenor. Hooker has a simple and straightforward answer, of lasting and far-reaching value. "To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of "the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they "do in that they are men, in that they are wise men and Christian "men some things, some things in that they are men misled and "blinded with error. As far as they follow reason and truth, we "fear not to tread the selfsame steps wherein they have gone, "and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which "is ancients and better, others whom we much more affect "leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather "follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects "resemble them whom we love<sup>1</sup>."

The passage which succeeds this is concerned with the defence of the use of the Surplice: and it is interesting chiefly as showing the change which had come over the feeling and policy of the Puritans on this point since the early years of Elizabeth's reign<sup>2</sup>. Then follows a series of chapters dealing with one point after another in the Puritan attack upon the details of the Morning and Evening Service. A full list of the alleged faults is given in Chapter xxvii, and successively they are all duly considered.

In the consideration of them there is for the most part little that is either difficult, or of primary importance for an entrance into Hooker's general position or an understanding of his theology. He is dealing with a number of details, and though from time to time his answer is expressly shown or plainly felt to spring out of a deep principle in his view of things<sup>3</sup>, while constantly the axioms or canons enunciated at the beginning of the Book are sustaining his argument, the main part of these chapters is concerned closely with particular and often somewhat small points in the controversy of his day. But in the course of these chapters nevertheless there are found some of the noblest and

<sup>1</sup> V. xxviii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., e.g., *Objections and Answers concerning Apparel of Priests and Ministers: and A Brief Discourse*

against the Outward Apparel and Ministering Garments of the Popish Church (1566).

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g., V. xl. 3, xlii. 7, 10.

most thoughtful passages, some of the happiest and most perfect expressions of a just appreciation, that he or (it may probably be said) any English writer has achieved. The account he gives of the help secured by the intermingling of lessons with prayers: his description of the Psalter: his profound treatment of the power and moral affinity of music: his sketch of the Arian controversy, the almost hopeless plight of the truth at certain stages in it, the heroic hopefulness and constancy of St. Athanasius: his clear statement of the serviceableness of many things which are hastily thought to have lost their use: his enumeration of the religious reasons a man may have for desiring a leisureable death<sup>1</sup>:—these are passages which may almost at every reading of them seem to disclose some depth of thought or excellence of language that was before unmarked. Liberty, strength, simplicity, justice, dignity:—the fretful ways of controversy have seldom been graced by the union of such qualities as these.

But in the 48th chapter Hooker comes to deal with a criticism which leads him into deep and great questions.

*for  
is  
only  
for  
men  
a secret*

Cartwright, in his controversy with Whitgift, had mentioned first among the "faults in the matter of our prayers" the petition in the Collect for Trinity Sunday that we may evermore be defended from all adversity. His objection against the petition was analogous to the Puritan insistence upon Scripture as the only rule of action<sup>2</sup>. "Forasmuch," he argued, "as there is no promise in the Scripture that we should be free from all adversity, and that evermore, it seemeth that this prayer might have been better conceived, being no prayer of faith, or of the which we can assure ourselves that we shall obtain it": and again at a later stage of the controversy, "Seeing our prayers made without faith be abominable, and no faith is able to be grounded, but upon the word of promise; it must needs follow that the prayer conceived without promise is likewise abominable<sup>3</sup>." Whitgift's contentions on the other hand are that Cartwright's argument would prove too much, barring, e. g., the prayer that we

<sup>1</sup> V. xxxiv. 1, xxxvii. 2, xxxviii. 1, xlii. 2-5, xlii. 12 (cf. J. B. Mozley, *Essays*, ii. 372), xlv. 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> The analogy comes out most clearly when Cartwright, citing 1 St. John, v. 14, "If we ask anything

"according to His Will, He heareth us," adds, "and that will is in His Word." T. C. iii. 200.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. T. C. i. 136 (apud Whitgift, vol. ii. p. 473, Parker Soc. Ed.), T. C. iii. 200.

should be free from all sin: that the petition criticized is grounded on our Lord's general promises, such as "Whatsoever ye shall ask in My Name that will I do": that, "because in asking of external things we be uncertain whether they be profitable for us or no, therefore we ask them with a condition (which although it be not expressed, yet it is always understood) 'if it be God's Will': and that "Christ Himself prayed to have the Cup of His Passion removed from Him, which undoubtedly He knew before would not be granted unto Him." With reference to this appeal to our Lord's example Cartwright is not content to take the exception which might be fairly taken to the terms in which Whitgift expresses it: he suggests, though he does not irrevocably advance, a further and far more precarious answer: "Although He knew that He should suffer, yet if I answer that as touching His Humanity, He knew not the most infinite and extreme weight of sufferances, which God His heavenly Father had measured unto Him, or knowing them, had through the unspeakable force of the pangs which He then was in, forgotten them, I see not how this answer may not be maintained as a Christian and Catholic answer<sup>1</sup>."

Such was the controversy which Hooker in his 48th chapter takes up and, after his wont, lifts into an ampler air. It may better illustrate his method, and may be more serviceable, to point out the great truths with which he irradiates the question at issue than to follow step by step his argument.

(1) He brings out the true conception of prayer. It is the utterance of a mind that views things in relation to God, and rises up towards Him in praise, in thanksgiving, or in entreaty. In the special sense in which the word is often used, it is the utterance of such a mind rising up to present its desires before God, with acknowledgement of its entire dependence upon Him: whether such presentation be, as it is in some cases, the means of obtaining what God has promised upon that condition to grant, or, as it is in other cases, simply the bringing before Him of a natural and lawful wish for something which He in His Love and Wisdom may or may not bestow. "Every good and holy desire though it lack the form, hath notwithstanding in itself the substance and with Him the force of a prayer, Who

<sup>1</sup> T. C. iii. 201.

"regardeth the very moanings, groans, and sighs of the heart  
"of man."

(2) And thus the true relation between prayer and faith becomes clear. It is not that prayer is necessarily a means to obtain what faith knows to have been expressly promised: for, if that were the necessary relation, then the necessary relation must have been lacking in all the prayers that were not followed by the event prayed for. The true relation is that the desires uttered in prayer are the desires of a mind that believes in God, and lays hold upon Him as revealed by and in Christ. And the prayer that thus rises up in faith, out of the believing mind, animated and characterized by faith, will receive its direction and its limitation from faith: not in the narrow, formal, textual sort of way, as limited to claiming what is particularly and precisely promised: but in free and intelligent and loving correspondence with the Mind and Character of God: desiring nothing that is selfish, unseemly, unholy, or in itself and of its own nature impossible: "determined by the mind of Christ": expressing not a man's "own lawless and short-sighted wants, but the will "and purposes of Christ, Who is the image of God: the will and "purposes of Him Whose victory was the victory of complete "Self-surrender, and Whose triumph was the fruit of what in the "eyes of men was completest failure." For "prayer in the name "of Christ is something which can only arise out of a will and "heart redeemed by Christ, and brought by Him into union "with God<sup>1</sup>."

(3) That prayer is faithful in virtue of this correspondence with the Mind and Character of God, and not as having in every instance an express and particular promise to point to and rely on, is proved by the example of Christ's prayers concerning His Passion<sup>2</sup>. The relevance of this example in the particular controversy was challenged, as has been said, by Cartwright on the ground that we know we shall not be defended from all adversity, Christ did not know, or else forgot, the weight of suffering which was to come upon Him, and therefore did not know that He should not obtain His petition. Against these

<sup>1</sup> C. Gore: *Prayer, and the Lord's Prayer*, pp. 16, 17. xiv. 36; St. Luke, xxii. 42; St. John, xii. 27.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matt. xxvi. 39; St. Mark,

suggestions Hooker's arguments are drawn from the language of the Gospels: but naturally on such a point he is not content simply to answer Cartwright: he sets himself to realize and unfold so far as he can the complex truth out of which each of the disputants, Cartwright and Whitgift, had taken only so much as he needed. If Christ "knew all things that should come upon Him," why did He pray that the Cup might pass from Him?—There is manifold and lasting value in Hooker's answer to that question:—Briefly told, it is this.

In every human will, or faculty of choice and avoidance, and therefore in the human will of Christ, there are two ways of working: its natural and simple working, whereby it chooses the end as good (the working, for instance, by which health is chosen), and its deliberate working, whereby that is chosen which is good for the simply chosen end (the working, for instance, by which medicine is chosen as good for health). According to this distinction there were in the human nature of Christ movements, workings, activities of desire which though they seemed to be opposed, were not so, neither the one to the other, nor either to the Will of God. Before our Lord there lay the unspeakable agony of conflict and of death, and also the unspeakable glory of the redeeming victory. In its natural and simple way of working, His human will shrank from the agony and desired to escape it: in its deliberate way of working, it chose the agony, for the sake of the victory:—thus abhorring what it embraced, and embracing what it abhorred. But these two movements or operations of His will were not really opposite the one to the other: since opposites, strictly, concern the same thing in the same regard: and these concerned the same thing in different regards: for, "consider death in itself, and nature teacheth Christ to shun it; "consider death as a means to procure the salvation of the world, "and mercy worketh in Christ all willingness of mind towards it. "Therefore in these two desires there can be no repugnant "opposition." Nor again was the desire of Christ's human will to escape death opposite to the determination of the divine will that He should suffer death: for the desire to escape had regard to death in itself: the determination that He should suffer had regard to death as a means towards an end. Nay, something more than this may be said: for if the simple action of Christ's

human will had not been towards avoiding death in itself, it would have been "against nature, and by consequent against "God<sup>1</sup>."

Thus then the prayer of Christ was the presentation before God of a natural, simple, right desire: it inculcates a conception of the act of prayer wide enough to include such a presentation of desire without reference to a specific promise of attainment: it may justly be adduced as warranting the prayer to be defended against all adversity: and it teaches wide and widely-needed lessons in regard to the Christian attitude towards affliction. For it shows that even the most perfect may be for awhile overclouded by anguish: that no assurance of ultimate victory can prevent the natural shrinking of the human heart: that God's determination may often be against the attainment of a natural desire, yet not against the desire itself: that the utterance and presentation of such desires in prayer is an acceptable offering to God, since it declares a trustful committal of the soul to Him, and is in accordance with His general and antecedent Will for the happiness of His own handiwork: and that such prayer is not fruitless, since it will elicit not release but grace, like the presence of the Angel strengthening the Saviour in His Agony.

It has seemed well to dwell upon this chapter, not only for the power it evinces and the beauty which will be found in it, but also because it is a good illustration of that broad, frank view of life, that reverence for human nature, which is among Hooker's clearest characteristics, severing him from many disputants in religious questions. The general line of his argument and, pre-eminently, one thought in it recur in the next chapter, the 49th, where he meets the Puritan objection against the prayer that all men may be saved. That prayer also was censured as seeking what is known to be impossible: since all men's salvation and some men's condemnation are things mutually repugnant. Hooker's main answer here is that though a mere intellectual judgement in the abstract may insist on the repugnance, men's actual conduct in the concrete takes its guidance from voluntary and moral correspondence with the Mind of God: and this prayer for the salvation of all men—a prayer which is the natural

<sup>1</sup> V. xlviii. 10. Cf. Sermon iv, in *Five Sermons on the Temptation*, vol. III, pp. 650-652; and W. H. Mill, pp. 34-37.

utterance of the will of love—is in correspondence with the general and antecedent Will of God, Who would have all men to be saved. That general, revealed Will is the guide of Christian longing and aspiration, even though concerning cases known to God alone there may be in Him a more private, occasioned, consequent Will, condemning those whom nevertheless, in conformity with His revealed Character, men rightly and religiously include in the breadth of the prayer of love. “To pray for all men living is but to show the same affection which towards every of them our Lord JESUS Christ hath borne, Who knowing only as God who are His did as man taste death for the good of all men<sup>1</sup>.”

*F. Chapters l-lvii.*

A student who reads this great section in Mr. Keble's edition may notice that in the notes to these chapters the references to the Admonitioners and to Cartwright, which have hitherto been frequent, wholly cease; for here, as in the First Book, Hooker draws back to a considerable distance from the arena of controversy, and works out the deep things he deals with undisturbed by the strife of tongues in his day. One is inclined to imagine that it would have been to his mind intolerably jarring and inappropriate to stay merely arguing with disputants about the sacred mysteries of the spiritual life: and that when he found men using language which seemed to him to cheapen that which he held most dear, he had to go apart and quietly think out the truths involved in the conscious reality of his own life in Christ. And so it has come to be the case that often these central chapters of the Fifth Book have without much loss been read with little reference to the debates which elsewhere have to be kept in view. Yet as one reads them carefully one may feel that the tenor and emphasis of Hooker's thought is affected to a considerable degree by tendencies in his day which he judged to be misleading and perilous. His sense of the dangerous shallowness and laxity of some minds with regard to the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, and his controversy with Travers about Justification may have led him to write with special care and strength on

<sup>1</sup> V, xlix. 5.

these points: but two other lines of teaching current at the time tell more clearly on his work. One against which he seems to be directing more or less explicitly much that he says was the teaching known as Ubiquitarian: that partial and erroneous developement of Lutheranism which taught that the human body of Christ by reason of its union with His Godhead was everywhere present, and that it had, as the body of the Son of God, the property of Ubiquity: an error which would have deprived it of the true and essential character of a human body, and led on easily to a Docetic or Eutychian view of it. The far-reaching disastrousness of such an opinion was clear to Hooker's strong theological sense: and as he delineates with a steady hand the truths it would impair, he has it constantly in sight.—The other element in the writings of his day which determines to some extent the course of his argument is the language used by the Puritans about the necessity of sacraments. Cartwright, for instance, had written: "Prayers and Sacraments forasmuch as they take effect by the preaching of the Word, where that is not, those do not only not feed, but are ordinarily to further condemnation<sup>1</sup>." "Forasmuch as I have proved before that no man may minister the Sacraments but he which is able to preach the Word, although I dare not affirm that there is an absolute necessity that the word should be preached immediately before the Sacraments be ministered, yet I can imagine no case wherein it is either meet or convenient, or else almost sufferable, that the Sacraments should be ministered without a sermon before them." Again, he had written, if the minister be not well enough to preach, "there is less inconvenience in deferring the Celebration of the Sacrament until he be strong enough to preach, than ministering it so maimedly and without a sermon<sup>2</sup>": and, with regard to the administration of Baptism by private persons, "the state of the question is, whether there be any such necessity of baptism, as for the attaining thereof the order which God hath set in His Church, of administering it by a public Minister, ought to be broken<sup>3</sup>:"—while a somewhat similar opinion in respect of the Holy Communion seemed to underlie the argument against the private Communion of the sick. The controversy concerning the private celebration of the Sacraments,

<sup>1</sup> T. C. ii. 364.<sup>2</sup> Id. i. 158.<sup>3</sup> Id. iii. 128.

turning mainly on the estimate of their necessity, is the chief influence from without urging Hooker to expound at length the truth about them. "Upon their force their necessity dependeth. So that how they are necessary we cannot discern till we see how effectual they are<sup>1</sup>." Accordingly, it is this that he labours to show.

Rich and elaborate in detail as these chapters are, the main lines of thought and structure are plain.—If a text were to be sought for the whole section it might be found in those words of St. Peter to which Hooker refers in lvi. 7: "Partakers of the divine nature":—for it is as means to the attainment of that height that he considers Sacraments. But the clearest statement of his plan and summary of his belief is found at the outset of the section. "Sacraments are the powerful instruments of God to eternal life. For as our natural life consisteth in the union of the body with the soul; so our life supernatural in the union of the soul with God. And forasmuch as there is no union of God with man without that mean between both which is both, it seemeth requisite that we first consider how God is in Christ, then how Christ is in us, and how the Sacraments do serve to make us partakers of Christ<sup>2</sup>."—The dominant note of all that he tries to teach on these great themes is *reality*. At point after point he seems to feel the loss that has come by confusion, haziness, looseness, poverty of thought: by declining from the steep and narrow way that climbs to the height of revealed truth: by swerving off or slipping down to some position which makes less demand on mind and heart than the very facts of the redemptive work: by substituting for the mystery that is "more true than plain," conceits and fancies that are "more plain than true." The shrinking of Nestorius from the perfect union of the "two natures human and divine conjoined in one and the same Person," the blurring by Eutyches of the perfect and unfringed and uneffaced humanity of Christ, the shadowiness and unreality of a human body imagined, by an error kindred to Eutychianism, as ubiquitous, the draining of significance out of the Communion of Saints by reducing it to a community of manhood, the attenuation of Sacraments by treating them merely as instructive symbols:—these are the dangers that he has before

<sup>1</sup> V. l. 3.

<sup>2</sup> V. l. 3.

him as he toils with the sustained effort of a strong and accurate intellect to set forth and maintain the fullness of the truth.

(1) "How God is in Christ": the truth and reality of the Incarnation:—in the first of the four chapters devoted to this theme Hooker labours to make it clear that "Incarnation may "neither be granted to any Person but only One, nor yet denied "to the Nature which is common unto all Three." Accordingly he begins by stating the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity: since that doctrine is essential to the recognition of the truth that the Person of the Son alone and not the Person of the Father or the Person of the Holy Ghost was made Man: yet that, "forasmuch as the Word and Deity are one subject," the Godhead of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is Incarnate: even the Nature of God Itself hath taken to Itself flesh. To forget this would be to "make the Son of God incarnate not to be very God": it would be to lose hold on the reality of God made one with man in Christ. But as that reality is obscured or denied, and thus the ground of true belief concerning Sacraments undermined, by any faltering from faith in the perfect and immutable Godhead of the Incarnate Word, so also and with like result is the reality of the Union of God and Man in Christ abandoned if Christ be divided into two persons, if it is forgotten that "His "making and taking to Himself our flesh was but one act": "that in Christ there is no personal subsistence but One, and that "from everlasting." It was thus that Nestorius went astray: and his error bears expressly and fatally on belief in the reality of Sacraments: since it would impair the perfectness of the union of the Godhead with Manhood: they would be only linked in the amity of two persons, not joined in the unity of One, the One Eternal Person of the Word Who was made Man: and by that loosening or splitting would be wrought an undermining of the ground of our communion with God, and of the full reality of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ: since it could no longer be maintained that "no person was born of the Virgin but the "Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of "God condemned, the Son of God and no other person crucified: "which one only point of Christian belief, *the infinite worth "of the Son of God*, is the very ground of all things believed "concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or

“suffered as man in our behalf<sup>1</sup>.”—It is with a like tenacity of regard to the reality of the redemptive work that Hooker also insists, as against Eutyches, on the unconfused integrity of both natures in Christ: for Eutychianism would discredit that work by infringing on the clear Manhood of the Incarnate Word, so that His atoning work would no longer stand as wrought by acts in a real human life; if His Manhood lost its distinct properties in confusion with His Godhead it would no longer be the very manhood of those He came to save; and the bridge Godward would be, as it were, taken out of the reach of men.

Here, as he speaks of Eutychianism, Hooker is approaching the kindred error of many in his day, the error of Ubiquitarianism. It is with this in view that in Chapters liii and liv he insists carefully on the truth that in the Personal and inseparable unity of the two natures each retains its natural properties unabolished, untransferred, unblended, though all belong to the same Person. The properties of the weaker nature are not overwhelmed or swallowed up in the presence of the more glorious: “*salvâ proprietate utriusque naturæ et substantiæ . . . suscepta est a maiestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas*”: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ σὰρξ ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐ θεότης, εἰ καὶ γέγονε Θεοῦ σὰρξ<sup>2</sup>. Nevertheless, this unconfused, unblurred integrity of each of the two Natures united in the one Person is still consistent with their concurrence and co-operation to one effect. The acts of the Incarnate Son may issue either from His Godhead, or from His Manhood, or from both concurrent—the acts being in every case alike His acts. And it is this truth that affords the key to certain expressions in Scriptural and Patristic language which might otherwise seem strange and be pressed towards Eutychian or Ubiquitarian thoughts: such expressions as “they crucified the Lord of Glory.” For in this and like expressions there is “a kind of mutual commutation,” a crossing-over of the two designations which both alike designate the One Person: the one takes the other’s place on the ground that both meet in Him. That which is true of the One Person in the entirety of His Incarnate life may be

<sup>1</sup> V. lii. 3. Cf. W. Bright, Sermons of S. Leo on the Incarnation, Note 5.

<sup>2</sup> St. Leo, Ep. xxviii, ad Flavianum,

§ 3, and St. Cyril, Ep. ad Succ., V. ii. 137. D., ed. 1638, quoted by Hooker on V. liii. 2.

asserted of Him according to either of His designations, though these designations are severally taken from one or other of the two distinct Natures united in Him.

Thus has Hooker guarded, in treating the first of his three great themes, the reality of both Natures in Christ and the reality of their union. But had he stayed here he would have left untold and unrecognized another element of the complex truth. It is true that "both natures do remain with their properties in "Christ thus distinct": but it is also true that the Manhood is enriched by the "gifts, graces and effects" which flow into it from the Godhead: and the clear recognition of the latter truth is necessary for the right definition and defence of the former: for error often finds a starting-point for its encroachment in some neglected part or aspect of the truth. Accordingly Hooker supplements his exposition of the reality and integrity of our Lord's Human Nature (neither invaded, nor overwhelmed, nor carried beyond its distinctive character by any transfusion of the properties of the Godhead), by showing what that Nature has received from its Union with the Divine Nature. To mark accurately what it has received is also to mark afresh and securely what it has not received: and as the withholding from it of that which it has not received guards its proper integrity, the conferring on it of that which it has received is its enrichment for the perfection of its work.

It seems to be for the further avoidance of misunderstanding, and for the elucidation of the words he uses, that Hooker here enlarges somewhat the field of enquiry, speaking of all the three degrees or ways in which Christ "is a receiver": thus including, besides what properly concerns the present question, the way in which Christ receives eternally, in that He is the Son of God. The three ways, then, are these:—

Christ has received by eternal generation, naturally and eternally, One and the Same Godhead which the Father hath of Himself, unreceived: for "*Pater tota substantia est, Filius vero "derivatio totius*"<sup>1</sup>.

Christ has received as man, by the Union of Deity with His Manhood, this gift from the Father: that those divine powers which the Father gives eternally and naturally to Him by

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Praxean*, ix., quoted by Hooker on V. liv. 2.

eternal generation should be exercised and wielded in His Incarnate life: exercised and wielded by Him being Man. That in Him all fullness should dwell: that He should have life in Himself, and a Name above every name: that He should be a fountain of life:—these are gifts comprised in that enabling, enriching, distinction of Christ as Man which flows from the union of His Manhood with the Godhead<sup>1</sup>. By these gifts His Manhood is changed and bettered and advanced in state and quality, while it is unchanged in substance: it shares His own right and title to the Kingdom of Heaven, it receives its mediatorial efficacy and empire, and its everlasting association in the exercise of divine power and the reception of divine praise.

Christ has received the gift of Unction, bestowed upon His soul and body: whereby they are replenished “with all such “perfections as they are in any way apt to receive”: a replenishing only delayed, checked, economized for the sake of the work, the abasement which He willingly undertook and sustained: the beams of Deity, the effects of the divine Unction, being restrained or enlarged according to the exigencies of that undertaking, as they pressed upon Him (as in the Temptation and the Crucifixion) or were relaxed (as in the Transfiguration and the Resurrection). Thus into the soul of Christ (subject to this Self-chosen, Self-maintained restriction) there flowed universal knowledge, though not the infinite knowledge which is the property of the Godhead: thus by the Vision of God was it filled with unique grace and virtue: thus was His body also glorified, but with a glory that His Own Will held back in deference to the work He had in hand. Yet even now in heaven, though the glory is released for its full effect, still that body which “God hath many ways above the reach of our “capacities exalted” is “a body consubstantial with our bodies,”

<sup>1</sup> The truth is clearly stated by Calvin, from whom Hooker may have taken in part the thought of it: “Sicut Pater vitam habet in “Semetipso, ita et Filius dedit vitam “habere in Semetipso.” Illic enim “proprie de Suis dotibus disserit, “non quas ab initio apud Patrem “possidebat, sed quibus ornatus fuit “in eâ ipsâ carne in quâ apparuit.”

Inst. IV. xvii. 9.

At this point Hooker raises, as if in parenthesis, the question what has accrued to Christ as the Son of God by the union of manhood with His Godhead: and answers, “the only “gain He thereby purchased for “Himself was to be capable of loss “and detriment for the good of “others.” V. liv. 4.

keeping still that nature and those limitations which are essential to its being what it is, essential to its reality as a human body.

(2) "How Christ is in us." Hooker enters on the consideration of this question by treating of the manner of the Presence of Christ: since right thoughts of this are necessary for understanding how He can be present in men, how men can partake of Him, how men can one by one receive Him Who is the healing of the world. And here he deals directly with that error of Ubiquitarianism which he has had more or less in view throughout the preceding chapters.

And first, in a passage of singular depth and wide importance, he shows how the limitation of every creature is both its perfection and its preservation. Limitation is often spoken of as though it were merely negative, if not derogatory: but those who so speak of it miss its true virtue and glory. For it is that which constitutes and guards the excellence of each created thing, its proportion and beauty and fitness for its end: it is that also which saves each created thing from the equal ruin of defect and of excess, preserving to it its characteristic form and nature: beyond which it can be carried only by a force external to itself, only to its own effacing.

All that is created is limited: God alone is infinite: infinite He is in His Substance and therefore in His Presence: "non solum universitati creaturæ, verum etiam cuilibet parti ejus totus pariter adest<sup>1</sup>." Christ therefore as God is everywhere present: but the Nature which He has by one act created and assumed would cease to be what it is if it did not keep its characteristic and perfecting and preserving limitation: as man or according to His human nature ubiquity cannot belong to Him, nor any range of presence which would break those bounds of restraint which guard the truth and reality and excellence of manhood. "Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus<sup>2</sup>." Beyond those bounds of restraint His human nature could be forced only to its own loss, and only by a force external to itself: and neither the gift of its union with the Godhead nor the gift of Unction flowing from the Godhead takes the human soul or body of Christ out

<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine, Ep. 187; II. 683, ed. 1679, quoted by Hooker on V. lv. 3.

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine, Ep. 187; II. 681, ed. 1679, quoted by Hooker on V. lv. 6.

of the integrity, the form, the distinctive limits of humanity. "The majesty of His estate" does not "extinguish the verity" of His human nature: "supernatural endowments are an advancement, they are no extinguishment of that nature whereto they are given."

"In regard of the fore-alleged proofs" Hooker holds it "a most infallible truth that Christ as man is not everywhere present."—But here again, had he stayed at this point, he would have left untold a complementary element of truth, without which the position he has defined fails, clearly and seriously, to correspond with the breadth of revelation and of the reality of Christ's work: and Hooker will not leave the truth he has enunciated exposed to the risks that may come from another truth ignored.—"*After a sort*" the Manhood of Christ *is* everywhere present. Though to be everywhere present cannot be or become a property of it, still in a certain sense it is so present; and that in three manners, and with direct bearing on the reality of grace.

By conjunction Christ's Manhood has universal presence: that is to say, by being nowhere severed from that which is everywhere present, the Person of the Son of God.

By co-operation it has this presence, working everywhere in all things with the Godhead: since God the Son now works nothing wherein His Manhood is either absent or idle.—This high exaltation of Christ's Manhood is the sequel of His willing humiliation of His Manhood unto death, even the death of the cross, when He restored by obedience the world which He had created by power<sup>1</sup>:—that royalty which flows from the gift of union and which was humbly veiled and suspended in the work of His Passion is now released in His Ascension and Session at the Right Hand of God: and His human soul now knows and assents to all God's work and government<sup>2</sup>.

By force and efficacy also even His human body has this presence: He has made it a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world: and He, the Son of God, present everywhere, pleads everywhere and throughout all generations of men, that sacrifice, "infinite in possibility of application."

In these three ways His Manhood, guarded still in its reality

<sup>1</sup> V. lv. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. VMI. iv. 6.

After a sort

By

(1) Conjunction

(2) Co-operation

(3) Efficacy

by its own characteristic limitation, unfringed and undispersed by any property of ubiquity, receives after a sort a derived power of being present everywhere, as inseparable from God, working with Him, and available everywhere for the salvation of men.—And in these ways He can, not as God only, but in this sense as man also, fulfil His promise to be present with His own.

From this consideration of Christ's presence Hooker goes on to treat of the manner of our participation in Christ: and it appears at once that the theme is somewhat more complex than his first statement of the question, "How Christ is in us." For the relation which he has to consider is reciprocal: since "participation is that mutual inward hold which Christ hath of us" and we of Him, in such sort that each possesseth other by way "of special interest, property, and inherent copulation<sup>1</sup>": it is the mysterious answer to the prayer that we may dwell in Him, and He in us: and this conception of participation as a reciprocal indwelling is steadily maintained in all that Hooker says of it.

After his wont, he enlarges the enquiry so as to include the widest range in which such indwelling is manifest: so that the special manifestation of it, which he labours to make clear, may be presented not only in itself but also in its contrast and likeness, its distinction and affinity, with reference to the other manifestations of the same mystery.

First he enunciates the twofold principle underlying in its breadth such "mutual inward hold." It is the principle of cause and effect, of Fatherhood and Sonship, of origin and outcome. "Every original cause imparteth itself unto those things which come of it: and whatsoever taketh being from any other, the same is after a sort in that which giveth it being<sup>2</sup>." In a certain sense that which gives being dwells in that to which it gives being: that which receives being dwells in that from which it receives being.

Then he points to this principle in its archetypal, highest, and most perfect reality, in the mutual indwelling, the absolute

<sup>1</sup> V. lvi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I. v. 1, 2, and Dean Church's note on that passage in his edition

of Bk. I.—Also, Sermon III. part iii. (vol. iii. p. 624): and St. Thomas Aquinas, I. vi. 1.

communion of the Three Persons in the One and Undivided Godhead: where within the One Substance there is derivation yet no severance: "the Father is in the Son, and the Son in Him, They both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both Them"<sup>1</sup>: by a full and perfect and eternal communion of the one Light, and Life, and Love: into which archetype of all true communion Christ has carried the manhood He assumed and bears.

This communion is in its perfectness unique. Widely different from it, yet resting on and illustrating the same twofold principle, is that mutual indwelling to which Hooker next points—that whereby God dwells in all His creatures and they dwell in Him<sup>2</sup>: He in them as goodness, wisdom, power, as their life, sustaining them: they in Him eternally, "as a work unbegun is in the "artificer which afterward bringeth it into effect."

But among the creatures whom God thus universally upholds there are some in whom by a further purpose, by an added generative act, He dwells in a special and distinctive way: some for whom the communion that creation constitutes is enhanced by the communion that supervenes in re-creation: some who are upheld not only by the goodness, wisdom, power that upholds all things, but by that goodness, wisdom, power radiant and operative with the special purpose and energy of salvation: some who are in God, and in whom God is, not only as their Creator, but also as their Saviour, knowing them and loving them as His own "special offspring among men." It is a distinctive intensity of divine indwelling that constitutes the communion of Saints with God in Christ; the mutual inward hold, the participation of Christ, which is the life of the Church.

Eternally, by their intended admission to life, the children of God were in Him as their Saviour, "as a work unbegun is in "the artificer which afterward bringeth it unto effect": eternally, through His knowledge of them, through His love of them in Christ, God inclined Himself toward them. But "our being "in Christ by eternal foreknowledge saveth us not without our "actual and real adoption into the fellowship of His Saints in "this present world": and "in Him we actually are by our "actual incorporation into that Society which hath Him for their

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. H. Newman, *Arians of the Fourth Century*, pp. 161, 2, 7; 178, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. R. Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*, pp. 66-73.

"Head, and doth make with Him one Body." "In God we actually are no longer than only from the time of our actual adoption into the body of His true Church, into the fellowship of His children." There and then He is in us "as the artificer is in the work which his hand doth presently frame," life coming to us from the Father, by the Son, through the Spirit: and we are in Him who knows and loves His Church<sup>1</sup>.

Such in general is Hooker's answer to the question, how Christ is in us: such is his conception of that union of men with God in Christ which is their life eternal. It is a conception which he seems to frame, define, hold, delineate with the utmost effort of his mind and heart. And, be it remembered, his mind was one of rare power and thoughtfulness and wealth, steeped by long study in the knowledge of the Bible and of the best achievements of Christian learning and reflection: and his heart rose up in the strength of a life of humility, unworldliness, and prayer: when he wrote of communion with God he wrote of that wherein he tried to live and was not afraid to die. It is not strange if to those whose thought and experience in the things of God are less than his, whose lives perhaps are beset by distractions from which he escaped, his words seem here and there too high and bold for them to grasp and realize with any security of personal apprehension and appropriation.—It does not follow that such words were otherwise than plainly and wholly real to Hooker: and it will be well for any man to press on where they point, with undiscouraged hope and labour to advance in that knowledge which can be but slowly gained, and in this life imperfectly:—that knowledge of which they may gain but little who are too ready to dismiss as unreal or fanciful or mystical what stronger, humbler men have written down as the secret of their life in God.

Before he passes on from this part of his theme, Hooker speaks of four points concerning this participation: and first of its *reality*. There were some who would have attenuated it to a mere community of nature with Christ, as though it meant no more than that we being men are by that fact linked with Him who became man<sup>2</sup>. Hooker justly says that "it is not

<sup>1</sup> V. lvi. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's Preface, § 46 (p. xciii. note 3).

"this that can sustain the weight of such sentences as speak of the mystery of our coherence with Jesus Christ." "His Body crucified and His Blood shed for the life of the world, are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us such as Himself is of Whom we come." "As we are really partakers of the body of sin and death received from Adam, so except we be truly partakers of Christ, and as really possessed of His Spirit, all we speak of eternal life is but a dream<sup>1</sup>."—In the second place Hooker speaks of *the Agent and the Instrument* of the participation. The Eternal Spirit, the Holy Ghost, sanctified human nature in Christ, made it an atoning sacrifice for sin through the willing death of Christ, raised it from the dead, exalted it to glory: and the same Holy Spirit now by it unites men with God in Christ, "usque ad societatem germanissimam eius<sup>2</sup>."—The third point concerns *the range in man of this participation*. It extends throughout a man's whole nature: it is no mere dependence of the soul on Christ: but from His flesh "our very bodies do receive that life" for which they are already accounted "parts of His body," that life which shall make them glorious at the resurrection, even their life everlasting. "Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with His body which is incorruptible."

In speaking, lastly, of the *order and degrees of this participation* Hooker seems to show some deficiency in arrangement and lucidity of treatment: but his language becomes clearer when it is taken together with the other passages in which he treats of the same subject<sup>3</sup>. In the light of and in comparison with those passages his teaching appears as follows.

That there are degrees in the participation of Christ is clear from three considerations. First, because that sanctification which His Spirit works in those who are His presupposes the preliminary breaking down of that barrier of sin and death which is in fallen man. Secondly, because, while all in a certain sense

<sup>1</sup> V. lvi. 7. Cf. Sermon II. § 26; Sermon III. Part i. pp. 612, 613.

<sup>2</sup> On this participation of Christ by the infusion of His Spirit rests the reality of the Communion of Saints one with another: because the same

Spirit which anointed Him, doth "formalize, unite, and actuate His whole race." V. lvi. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. V. lx. 2, App. I. §§ 12, 13, 16; Sermon II. §§ 3, 21.

participate in Christ as Creator and Governor of the world, all do not participate in Him as their Saviour. Thirdly, because those who participate in Him as their Saviour still do not all equally show forth in holiness of life the fullness of His indwelling. Yet Christ cannot be divided: His Person wheresoever He dwells is whole and indivisible: His indwelling cannot be fragmentary. Wherein, then, are these degrees of participation, these differences of less and more partaking, to be traced?

They are in the effects which flow into men from Him, the graces, fewer or more, which men receive and admit into their hearts and lives from the fullness of His indwelling presence by the work of His Holy Spirit.—First of all His grace in men works faith: “the condition required in us for our personal “qualification”<sup>1</sup> unto that partaking of Christ by imputation which achieves the remission of our sins for His sake: God accepting us as righteous in Him: imputing to us “such acts “and deeds of His as could not have longer continuance than “while they were in doing, nor at that very time belong unto “any other but to Him from whom they come”: and for the merit of these deeds putting away our sins.—Then the grace of inward sanctification flows into the souls of men, receiving into themselves Christ by a real infusion of actual righteousness: receiving that holiness which afterward beautifieth all the parts and “actions of”<sup>2</sup> their life: receiving “by steps and degrees the “complete measure of all such divine grace as doth sanctify and “save throughout, till the day of their final exaltation to a state “of fellowship in glory, with Him whose partakers they are now “in those things that tend to glory”<sup>3</sup>.”

Thus “Christ is in us”: and thus are we in Him.

3. What then is the relation of sacraments to this achievement of God’s merciful work, what part, what use have they in regard to it? How do they “serve to make men partakers of Christ”?

Hooker’s answer is not doubtful or obscure.—He first dismisses with characteristic decision the poor and cold and meagre thought of them as merely serving “to teach the mind, by other “senses, that which the Word doth teach by hearing”: and then

<sup>1</sup> App. i. § 16. Cf. VI. iii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Sermon II. § 21.

<sup>3</sup> V. lvi. 13. Cf. App. i. § 13.

he enumerates certain true but subordinate uses of them: uses upon one or other of which men have laid undue stress, and so seemed irreconcilable when really they differed only in the diverse allocation of disproportionate emphasis. And so he passes on to speak of "their chiefest force and virtue"; their place in regard to men's participation in Christ and His indwelling in men. Their purpose in that regard they hold by God's ordaining: and it is a twofold purpose. As by the flame of fire in the bush Moses was shown the presence of the Glory of God, Whom he could not see and live: as the troubling of the waters of Bethesda declared the presence of the invisible power to heal: as the fiery tongues made known the advent of the Holy Ghost: so sacraments give notice of "Christ and His Holy Spirit with "all their blessed effects entering into the soul of man." But this is not all. Sacraments are also "means conditional which "God requireth in them unto whom He imparteth grace": since "it pleaseth Almighty God to communicate by sensible means "those blessings which are incomprehensible." "That saving "grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good "of His whole Church, by sacraments He severally deriveth into "every member thereof."

Thus sacraments are the divinely appointed means of that participation of Christ, that union of the soul with God, which is the supernatural life of man: they are, as Hooker had said at the outset of this section, "the powerful instruments of God to "eternal life." And herein lies their necessity: since it is not "*ordinarily* His will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, "but by the sacraments."—Only, in the recognition of this necessity it must be remembered that it is not constituted by any physical law: it does not rest on any power or efficacy absolutely implanted in the sacraments or inherent in them: it is not in all respects like the necessity of food for the bodily life. "Sacraments are not physical but moral instruments of "salvation": that grace which "is a consequent of sacraments" is received "from God Himself the Author of sacraments and not "from any other natural or supernatural quality in them<sup>1</sup>." "For of sacraments the very same is true which Solomon's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. V. lx. 7: "Not from them, but from Him, yet by them as by His "appointed means."

"wisdom observeth in the brazen serpent, 'He that turned  
 "towards it was not healed by the thing he saw, but by Thee,  
 "O Saviour of all.'" "For the use of sacraments we have God's  
 "express commandment, for the effect His conditional promise: so  
 "that without our obedience to the one, there is of the other no  
 "apparent assurance, as contrariwise where the signs and sacra-  
 "ments of His grace are not either through contempt unreceived,  
 "or received with contempt, we are not to doubt but that they  
 "really give what they promise, and are what they signify."

Hooker's teaching of this truth has been given almost wholly in his own words: for as he draws near the end of this great section of his work he speaks very plainly: and what he says leaves little room for comment or condensation. But it may be helpful to quote two passages from other parts of his writing, not only to present the same thoughts with a somewhat different light upon them, but also to show with what steady consistency he holds to what is here taught. "Sacraments with us," he says elsewhere, "are signs effectual: they are the instruments of God, "whereby to bestow grace; howbeit grace not proceeding from "the visible sign, but from His invisible power<sup>1</sup>." And again:—"At the time when He giveth His heavenly grace, He applieth by "the hands of His ministers that which betokeneth the same: "nor only betokeneth, but, being also accompanied for ever with "such power as doth truly work, is in that respect termed God's "instrument, a true efficient cause of grace; a cause not in itself, "but only by connexion of that which is in itself a cause, namely "God's own strength and power"<sup>2</sup>."

In conclusion Hooker speaks of the distinction between the gift conveyed in Baptism and the gift conveyed in the Eucharist: the distinctness of the gifts pointing to a distinct necessity in each case. In both sacraments Christ is received: but from Him in the one case the grace that is proper to Baptism, in the other, the grace that is proper to the Eucharist. In the one case Christ comes as the first beginner, in the other as "by continual degrees "the finisher of our life"<sup>3</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> App. i. § 18.

<sup>2</sup> VI. vi. 11. Cf. VI. vi. 10; St. Thomas Aquinas, III. lxii. 5, lxiv. 1;

Alexander Knox, Remains, vol. ii. p. 235.

<sup>3</sup> V. lvii 6.

*G. Chapters lviii-lxv.*

Hooker has set forth the principle of sacraments in general, and the truths which sustain his conviction of their efficacy as means of grace, and his consequent estimate of their necessity. His work takes a different character as it returns into closer contact with controversy in the section now to be considered, the section concerning Baptism. The Puritan attack on the order and practice of the Church of England in regard to Baptism was twofold: it assailed the abatement of certain requirements in cases of necessity, and the retention of certain ceremonies. The former part of the attack was the more serious: and at one point Hooker's task is plainly difficult.

The Puritans objected to the use of Private Baptism, and asserted that "the orders which God hath set" required "that it" should be done in the Congregation": they objected still more strenuously to Baptism by a layman, alleging that "on this" point, whether he be a minister or no, dependeth not only the "dignity but also the being of the Sacrament": they objected with a further increase of vehemence to Baptism by a woman "whose unaptness herein is double to that of a layman."—A part of the difficulty of meeting these criticisms lay in the fact that on the last two points the mind of the Church of England was not (as indeed it is not) fully, definitely, and positively expressed in its formularies. With regard to the sanction given for Private Baptism in cases of necessity, there could, of course, be no doubt: the Office provided for such use made clear the wish of the Church. But it was only by inference from the rubrics (though the rubrics as they stood in Hooker's day obviously suggested and certainly warranted the inference) that approval could be claimed for Baptism by a layman: and there was nothing in the Prayer Book to indicate decisively whether any such approval was or was not intended to reach to Baptism by a woman. In 1604 the rubrics were so altered as to cease to warrant any inference of approval: and in 1662 they were changed a little further in the same direction, to the form in which they now stand; a form from which no sanction for lay-Baptism can be inferred. But in the rubric at the end of the Office for Private Baptism it is still said only concerning water and the use of

the necessary words that they "are essential parts of Baptism": "and they alone are mentioned in the enquiry as to things "essential to this Sacrament" which "may happen to be "omitted." Thus the Church gives no positive sanction for lay-Baptism: it may even be said<sup>1</sup> to have withdrawn sanction from it, though without expressly prohibiting it: but it gives good ground for inferring that such baptism, whether it be by a layman or by a woman, is to be regarded as valid: and this, though nowhere explicitly asserted by the Church of England, has been in practice generally accepted as true. It may fairly seem a matter for regret that in so important a point the judgement and counsel of the Church is not more plainly declared: for the formula "*factum valet, fieri non debuit*," however just and convenient it may be as summing up the view to be taken of an isolated case here and there, gives but equivocal or contradictory guidance to those who doubt whether they should or should not do that which the Church seems to disallow as irregular, yet seems to recognize as valid, and which will be left undone unless they do it<sup>2</sup>. It is a real difficulty, in regard to which individuals ought scarcely to be left to choose between inconsistent indications by the light of such evidence from tradition as they, or those whom they consult, may chance to have.

In Hooker's time, as has been said, the practice of lay-Baptism had a warrant in the Prayer Book which has since been withdrawn: and there was nothing in the rubric (as there seems to be little in reason) to constitute a distinction in this regard between laymen and women. But the allowance and the prevalence of Baptism by women was denied by more than one writer of weight<sup>3</sup>: and all that was generally maintained was that such Baptism, however irregular and even blameworthy it might be judged, was not invalid: that one who had received it was to be regarded as truly baptized.—This is all that Hooker at all confidently maintains: it was natural to him to dread the

<sup>1</sup> Unless indeed it be thought "that "a 'lawful minister' does not necessarily mean one in holy orders, and "that it may include a layman, on "the supposition that a layman can "lawfully baptize."—But "it is impossible to hold this contention in "the face of the history of the

change." W. Elwin, *The Minister of Baptism*, pp. 211, 212.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Elwin, *The Minister of Baptism*, pp. 4-6, 196-198.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Whitgift, *Defence of the Answer*, ii. pp. 495, 519, 533; iii. 492, 3 (Parker Soc. Ed.); Keble's notes on Hooker, V. lxii. 3.

risk of presumption, and the approach to anything which might tend "to dissolve that order which is the harmony of God's "Church"<sup>1</sup>: it was only at the point at which it was asserted that Baptism by a woman was "no more the holy Sacrament "of Baptism than any other daily or ordinary washing of the "child"<sup>2</sup>, that he firmly took his stand.

There is little in his argument that is obscure: though at one point he plainly slips: for in alleging an analogy between illegitimate birth and lay-Baptism he forgets the distinction he himself had drawn between physical and moral instruments<sup>3</sup>, between causation in the sphere of nature and causation in the sphere of grace. But there are two subjects on which fresh light falls in the course of his argument: they are (1) the essential parts of a Sacrament and (2) the necessity of Baptism.

With regard to the former of these two subjects Hooker notices a variation in the use of the word sacrament. It is most often used as embracing both the outward and the inward substance, both that of which the senses take cognizance, and the secret grace. And so in definitions of sacraments grace is "mentioned as their true essential form, elements as the matter "whereunto that form doth adjoin itself." But if sacraments are distinguished from sacramental grace, then the name connotes only the outward substance, which consists of two parts: the elements and the words which give them their form. And thus in sacraments, according to the fuller connotation of the term, as including both what is outward and what is inward, there are three essential parts, the grace, the elements, and the words. But there is one other thing requisite: to wit, a serious meaning in the act, consonant with its religious character. This indeed it is impossible to be fully assured of in the mind of the individual celebrant of the Sacrament: and "therefore always "in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth "suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume "that he which outwardly doeth the work, hath inwardly the "purpose of the Church of God"<sup>4</sup>. To this conception of what is essential in Baptism Hooker steadily holds: "If Baptism "seriously be administered in the same element and with the

<sup>1</sup> V. lxii. 13. Cf. *ibid.* § 3.

<sup>3</sup> V. lvii. 4.

<sup>2</sup> T. C. i. 144. Cf. *id.* iii. 142.

<sup>4</sup> V. lviii. 3.

"same form of words which Christ's institution teacheth, there is "no other defect in the world that can make it frustrate, or "deprive it of the nature of a true Sacrament." "All that "belongeth to the mystical perfection of Baptism outwardly, is "the element, the word; and the serious application of both "unto him which receiveth both; whereunto if we add that secret "reference which this action hath to life and remission of sins "by virtue of Christ's own compact solemnly made with His "Church, to accomplish fully the Sacrament of Baptism, there is "not anything more required<sup>1</sup>." The point was clearly one of primary importance in regard to the controversy which Hooker had in hand: for the chief strength of his argument lay in maintaining that, provided these essentials were guarded, "all other "orders, rites, prayers, lessons, sermons, actions and their circum- "stances whatsoever," "are to the outward substance of Baptism "but things accessory, which the wisdom of the Church of Christ "is to order according to the exigence of that which is principal<sup>2</sup>": and that the wisdom of the Church had allowed private baptism in cases of necessity and recognized the validity of lay-baptism.

For the necessity of Baptism Hooker relied not only on the general ground of the relation of Sacraments to everlasting life, but also on the traditional interpretation of St. John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot "enter into the kingdom of God": and he defends against Cartwright's criticism this traditional interpretation of those words as referring to the element of water and to the inward grace in Baptism. The character of the necessity which on these grounds he maintains is accordant with what he has previously said concerning the necessity of Sacraments: it is not such a necessity as that by which an effect depends upon its physical cause: it is a necessity resting on God's appointment: the grace which is given with Baptism "doth so far forth depend on the "very outward Sacrament, that God will have it embraced not "only as a sign or token what we receive, but also as an instru- "ment or mean whereby we receive grace, because Baptism is "a Sacrament which God hath instituted in His Church, to the "end that they which receive the same might thereby be in-

<sup>1</sup> V. lxii. 12, 15.

<sup>2</sup> V. lviii. 4. Cf. Whitgift, *Defence of the Answer*, ii. 528, 532.

“corporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life<sup>1</sup>.” The truth of this necessity is not effaced by but rather is embraced in the truth of the divine election: since that “includeth a subordination of means without which we are not actually brought to enjoy what God secretly did intend; and therefore to build upon God’s election if we keep not ourselves to the ways which He hath appointed for men to walk in, is but a self-deceiving vanity<sup>2</sup>.” Similarly, the necessity of faith does not interfere with the necessity of Sacraments: the act of faith does not dispense with but includes the use of Sacraments: the promises of God, made to faith being conditional upon faithful obedience to His precepts. “In potestate Dei est præter ista (sc. sacramenta) hominem salvare, sed in potestate hominis non est sine istis ad salutem pervenire<sup>3</sup>.”—But the divine law which makes Baptism necessary, as “the door of our actual entrance into God’s House, the first apparent beginning of life,” “must be construed and understood according to rules of natural equity”: “*There may be in divers cases* life by virtue of inward baptism, “even where outward is not found.” It is inconceivable that those whose Baptism was prevented by martyrdom lost their reward: it has been steadily held that the faithful and sincere desire of Baptism, faultlessly hindered from the Sacrament, might stand instead of it: and with regard to infants dying unbaptized it may well be believed “that God all-merciful to such as are not in themselves able to desire Baptism, imputeth the secret desire that others have in their behalf, and accepteth the same as theirs rather than casteth away their souls for that which no man is able to help.” By such exceptions the necessity of receiving Baptism is equitably qualified. But the necessity, the obligation of administering it stands unimpaired, to be obeyed even with omission, if need be, “of those things that serve but only “for the more convenient and orderly administration thereof<sup>4</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> V. lx. 2.

<sup>2</sup> V. lx. 3.

Whitgift, Defence of the Answer, ii. 537.

<sup>3</sup> Hugo de Sacramentis, I. ix. 5, quoted by Hooker in V. lx. 4. Cf.

<sup>4</sup> V. lx. 5-7.

The Puritan attack on the Ceremonial of Baptism was directed chiefly against two points; the questions addressed to and answered by the Sponsors in the name of the infant brought to be Baptized, and the use of the Sign of the Cross.

With regard to the former of these points exception was taken both to the substance and to the form of the questions. With regard to the substance it was alleged that "children have not, nor "cannot have, any faith, having no understanding of the word of "God," and that "if children could have faith, yet they that "present the child cannot precisely tell whether that particular "child hath faith or no." With regard to the form, the Minister's questioning the Sponsors, and the Sponsors' answering, as though they were the child, was blamed as unreal and trifling<sup>1</sup>.

Hooker's answer to the criticism on the substance of the questions is interesting: and it will probably seem on reflection more satisfactory than it does at first sight. He falls back, as others had done in the same matter<sup>2</sup>, on a remarkable letter of St. Augustine.—The answer which is made on the child's behalf belongs to, is contemporaneous with, is part of the celebration of the Sacrament: and in the answer the effect wrought through the Sacrament is taken into account. Baptism is the Sacrament of Faith: it lays the first foundation of Faith: it conveys that grace which begins the life of Faith. "Cum respondetur parvulus "credere qui fidei nondum habet affectum, respondetur fidem "habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum "propter conversionis sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti<sup>3</sup>." In the Christian life grace and faith increase in common growth towards perfection: from the beginning to the end the Christian goes from grace to grace, and from faith to faith: and the recipient of the gift of grace is the recipient of the germ of faith. By the increase of grace and of faith the child is to "lead the rest of his life according to this "beginning" which is made in Baptism: and in this beginning there is the dawn of faith with the bestowal of grace. "The

<sup>1</sup> Cf. T. C. i. 169, quoted in Whitgift's Defence, iii. 115, 116.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Whitgift, Defence, iii. 111, 112. And Beza's reference in the letter quoted by Keble in V. lxiv. 1. "Cuperemus istam non modo super-

vacuam sed etiam ineptam interrogationem omitti, quantumvis illam in epistola quadam Augustinus ipse aliqua interpretatione tueatur."

<sup>3</sup> S. Aug. Ep. xcvi. (al. xxiii.) § 9.

in of Faith  
a Baptism  
by immersion  
from the  
water and  
the child  
is "as dead"  
the rest of  
his life  
according  
to this  
beginning

"habit of faith which afterwards doth come with years, is but *"a farther building up of the same edifice, the first foundation whereof was laid by the sacrament of Baptism"*: and in the broad and generous judgement of a humble, hopeful mind, not cramped by narrow canons, the title of believers may be granted to infants *"as being in the first degree of their ghostly motion towards the actual habit of faith"*<sup>1</sup>."

To the Puritan criticism on the form in which the interrogatories and the answers to them were put Hooker replies that Baptism implies a covenant: God bestowing remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit and "binding also Himself to add *"in process of time what grace soever shall be farther necessary for the attainment of everlasting life"*"; the baptized soul binding itself to faith and to newness of life.—The covenant is wholly, absolutely for the good of those whom God admits to it:—and therefore it is sheer mercy and bounty that makes it open to infants, allowing others to undertake on their behalf what they cannot yet undertake for themselves. And because the promise which the sponsors so make is virtually the children's act, belonging to them, binding on them, as the act of a guardian for a ward's benefit belongs to the ward, therefore *"the Church doth best to receive it of them in that form which best showeth whose the act is"*<sup>2</sup>."

Hooker meets one by one the several objections urged against the use of the Cross in Baptism: and his arguments seem clear and just and adequate. It is not necessary here to follow them at length: but on three points their value goes far beyond the controversy in which he employs them: and they may be briefly indicated.—In the first place, he speaks with depth and beauty of the meaning with which the Sign of the Cross was used in Baptism: and what he says illustrates that wider sacramentalism which characterized his reverent and thoughtful view of things. The meaning of the sign is to help men to deal rightly with the motive of shame. Shame is a fear of ignominy: and ignominy is rightly attached to some things, wrongly to others: so that shame correspondingly is right in some cases, wrong in others: and reason and religion teach men when it is right and when it is wrong. But men also need or at least are helped by a present

<sup>1</sup> V. lxiv. 2.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxiv. 6.

admonition, both to quicken shame, where shame is virtuous, and to drive off shame, where shame is cowardly. And it is for this that the sign and recollection of the Cross is helpful: as men have used, in time of temptation, the thought of some one standing by them whom they could not bear to offend or disappoint. Aptly the sign is signed upon the forehead, behind which fancy works raising the imaginations that scare or embolden men, and on which the outward evidence of shame appears when men are doing or thinking wickedly: and so it serves to help men to be ashamed of inclining towards what is shameful,—to help them not to be ashamed of what the world miscalls mean or poor-spirited or ridiculous, not to be ashamed of Christ when He is “honoured with disdain and scorn.”—Secondly, in glancing at the misuse of the Crucifix in the Church of Rome and at the danger of idolatry in regard to it, Hooker meets, with a warning of permanent import, the refinement which would prove that there is no such danger—(no danger, that is, of men’s thoughts halting at the material object and not rising up from it to God)—in the adoration of a dead image, “which every man knoweth to be void of excellency in itself, and therefore will easily conceive that the honour done unto it hath an higher reference.”—“In actions of this kind,” he wisely answers, “we are more to respect what the greatest part of men is commonly prone to conceive, than what some few men’s wits may devise in construction of their own particular meanings<sup>1</sup>.”—Thirdly, he has a sensible reply to Cartwright’s argument that “contrary diseases must have contrary remedies”: and that “if therefore the old Christians, to deliver the Cross of Christ from contempt did often use the Cross, the Christians now to take away the superstitious estimation of it ought to take away the use of it<sup>2</sup>.”—“In sores and sicknesses of the mind,” Hooker answers, “we are not simply to measure good by distance from evil, because one vice may in some respect be more opposite to another than either of them to that virtue which holdeth the mean between them both.” “If he that seeketh to reform covetousness or superstition should but labour to induce the contrary, it were but to draw men out of lime into coal-dust. So that their course which will remedy the superstitious abuse of things

<sup>1</sup> V. lxv. 15.<sup>2</sup> T. C. i. 171.

“profitable in the Church is not still to abolish utterly the use thereof, because not using at all is most opposite to ill using, but rather if it may be to bring them back to a right perfect and religious usage, which albeit less contrary to the present sore is notwithstanding the better and by many degrees the sounder way of recovery<sup>1</sup>.”

*H. Chapter lxvi.*

Hooker seems to have been patient rather by grace and self-discipline than by natural temperament: and he had a scholar's quick resentment against careless fault-finding. He treated men with thorough and humble and sincere respect when they seriously differed from him and were willing to take real pains to uphold their genuine conviction that he was gravely wrong: his great treatise had its beginning in such reverence for his opponents. But he could not pretend respect when the attacks he had to meet were obviously rash and ill-considered: and as one reads the criticisms made in the Admonitions and by Cartwright<sup>2</sup> on the use of Confirmation, one may understand why Hooker deals but slightly and somewhat slightly with them. Cartwright's primary challenge, “Tell me why there should be any such Confirmation in the Church,” he answers at some length, by showing the origin and meaning of Confirmation, its continuity through the abatement of the miraculous powers which came in early ages by the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the causes of its severance in ordinary use from Baptism:—the other objections thrown at it he briefly dispels in the last section of the chapter.

On one point he allows himself to speak of his ecclesiastical superiors with a severity unusual in him, but not unjust. There is “great cause,” he says, “to make complaint of the deep neglect of this Christian duty almost with all them to whom by right of their place and calling the same belongeth”:—a neglect which will be still bearing its unhappy fruit when the Puritan disparagement of Confirmation is forgotten. The complaint is

<sup>1</sup> V. lxx. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's note on V. lxvi. 8, and T. C. i. 199, iii. 232-4.

amply borne out by a letter written by Archbishop Whitgift in 1591 to the Bishops of the Southern Province. The Archbishop, after speaking of the great harm which has come by the neglect of Catechizing, censures the common omission of the charge at the end of the Baptismal Office, relating to the instruction of the child in the Catechism, with a view to Confirmation, and points to that carefulness about religious teaching which was enforced on parents by the requirement that their children should be taught, if they were to be Confirmed. He continues, "I am very sorry to hear that my brethren the Bishops of my province of Canterbury do so generally begin to neglect to confirm children, at least to call for, and exact the use both of it, and of catechizing children in the Church by the minister": and he adds that "these wants are now grown so common and offensive by the ill effects which they are found to yield" that he cannot with a clear conscience refrain from urging on the Bishops their duty in these regards<sup>1</sup>.—Hooker seems to have had good reason to feel that more harm was likely to come through the neglect of Confirmation, by those who were bound to maintain and administer it, than any of the Puritan censures of it would effect.

### *I. Chapters lxvii, lxviii.*

The former of these two chapters is among the deepest and noblest parts of Hooker's work; and it is pathetic to think how strenuously and earnestly he must have laboured for accuracy and balance in it, and how often a single sentence of it is recalled, as warrant for ranking him with the disputants on one side of the very debate he wrote to deprecate. The purpose of the chapter is to define the bearing which he would have men hold with regard to the Eucharistic controversy. Its connexion with the Puritan attack seems slight: for the Eucharist, as for Baptism, Hooker is anxious to show such necessity as warrants a departure in special cases from the order which should generally be observed: and the conclusion which he draws relates to this point. But the substance of the chapter is animated by no merely controversial impulse: it tells the thoughts and longings which had grown in

<sup>1</sup> Works of Archbishop Whitgift, iii. 610, 611. Cf. Keble's Hooker, note 1 on V. lxvi. 8.

Hooker as he quietly meditated on the mystery which men dragged into heartless and fruitless disputations. It is an eager, humble plea for peace on the high ground and in the calm air of undisputed truth.

For the understanding of the chapter it is essential that this, its dominant purpose, should be borne in mind. Hooker had marked that a great change had come over the Eucharistic controversy. Before the twofold force of Calvinism and Lutheranism, convergent but never combined, the bare negations of crude Zwinglianism had fallen into the background. Practically it seemed no longer necessary, in seeking for a basis of agreement, to take into account such cold and shallow views as had been expressed in the sentences "*Est Eucharistia nihil aliud quam 'commemoratio, qua ii qui se Christi morte et sanguine firmiter 'credunt Patri reconciliatos esse, hanc vitalem mortem annunciant': 'Spiritualiter edere corpus Christi nihil est aliud quam 'spiritu et mente niti misericordia et bonitate Dei propter 'Christum': 'Sacramentaliter autem edere corpus Christi, cum 'proprie volumus loqui, est, adjuncto sacramento, mente ac spiritu 'corpus Christi edere'*."<sup>1</sup> The bulk of those who were called Sacramentaries had, in Hooker's judgement, a far more adequate and lofty conception of the Eucharist than this: certainly Calvin himself had written far more worthily of it. And thus the range of controversy might be regarded as narrower than it had been. An English Churchman looking at the field of debate might see that the three groups of disputants, the Sacramentaries, the Lutherans, and the Romanists, held in common certain great, uplifting truths. That in the Eucharist there is a *real participation* of Christ, and of life in His Body and Blood: that this real participation of Christ is *by means of the Eucharist*: that "these "holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally "impart unto us even in true and real though mystical manner "the very Person of our Lord Himself, whole, perfect, and "entire"<sup>2</sup>: these inspiring affirmations found expression in all three schools. What remained doubtful and disputed was whether the Body and Blood of Christ were also externally

<sup>1</sup> Zuinglius, *De vera et falsa Religione Commentarius*, Opp. II. p. 212 b; *Fidei Christianæ Expositio*, Opp. II. p. 544 b (ed. 1581). Cf.

Hardwick, *Church History, Reformation*, p. 154; Browne on the Articles, pp. 702-4.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxvii. 8.

resident in the very consecrated elements themselves: whether upon the altar and apart from reception the elements contained that which, being received, they did, according to the belief of all three schools, convey to the receiver. There came the divergence: the Sacramentaries giving one answer, the Lutherans and the Romanists another; and then, on the divergent lines, the Lutherans and the Romanists going on to define the manner of this external presence; by the invisible moulding up of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood with the substance of the bread and wine, as in red-hot iron there is the substance both of iron and of fire; or by the hiding of the substance of Christ's Body and Blood under the mere "visible show of bread and wine, "the substance whereof is abolished, and His succeeded in the "same room"<sup>1</sup>."

Such was the state of belief and controversy which Hooker had marked in his day. But he had also marked a contrast of deep significance: a contrast which may have struck some in later days, comparing, for instance, the character of controversial writings about the Eucharist with the character of the Book relating to it in the *Imitation of Christ*. It was the contrast between the frigidness and tediousness of what men said and wrote about the field in which they differed, and the glow and life and freshness and beauty of what they said and wrote of that in which they agreed. "Of that which is proper to themselves "their discourses are hungry and unpleasant, full of tedious and "irksome labour, heartless and hitherto without fruit; on the "other side read we them or hear we others, be they of our own "or of ancients times, to what part soever they be thought to "incline touching that whereof there is controversy, yet in this "where they all speak but one thing their discourses are heavenly, "their words sweet as the honeycomb, their tongues melodiously "tuned instruments, their sentences mere consolation and joy"<sup>2</sup>." That contrast seemed to Hooker to go beyond the literary difference between controversial and devotional writings. It pointed, he believed, to a depth of reality and inspiring power in the one object of thought and meditation which was not equalled (to say the least) in the other: to an absorbing sufficiency in the one object of faith which in the other men had not found: it

<sup>1</sup> V. lxvii. 3.<sup>2</sup> V. lxvii. 12.

sounded to him as a voice from heaven, saying where God would have the minds and hearts of His children turned to dwell and rest in the contemplation of His goodness to them.

The guidance afforded by this contrast concurred with the significance felt by Hooker in the position which the questions concerning the Eucharist had reached in his day. Sure of God's care for the Church, reverent towards human reason, watchful for the teaching of events, he saw the one theme of faith and meditation and thanksgiving,—the consummation of the Holy Communion by the entrance of Christ Himself into the soul of man,—drawing towards itself men's minds and hearts with an increasing unanimity of belief in the high and awful truth, commanding the devotion and uplifting the thoughts and lives of men of all schools: while on the other hand he saw the wasteful, bitter, barren controversy about the earlier stage in the Eucharistic mystery dragging on from age to age and dividing those whom Christ had bidden live in unity. And so he makes his great appeal that men should concentrate their thoughts on that real Presence of Christ which by means of the Eucharist they do in truth receive: that they should steadily make that the primary and central and dominant point on which to fix their gaze as they tried to move forward in apprehension of the Eucharistic mystery: that they should refrain and check back their minds from returning to scrutinize that stage in it which was beset with unprogressive controversy: that they should seek the fulfilment of Christ's words where beyond debate or doubt it was to be found, in all reality and perfection, in the glorious coming of the Incarnate Son of God, through the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, to dwell within the soul of man. "The real presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." "Shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how?" "What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the Body and Blood of Christ." "Sith we all agree that by the Sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform His promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether

“by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation the Sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ, or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this Sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of His omnipotent power which maketh it His Body and Blood to us, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as they imagine we need not greatly to care nor inquire. Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary<sup>1</sup>.”

This then is Hooker's deliberate, clear, distinctive line of teaching in regard to the Eucharist. It is a line which had much specially to recommend it in the circumstances of his day, a day of tumult and transition, when quiet and balanced presentation of the truths that were being dragged this way and that in hot contention had little chance of being understood: it is a line which would keep a man's mind in the way to welcome further light, if further light should come. And it is also a line which at all times is tenable, intelligible, hopeful. All are not likely to think it adequate: whether it is so or not, this is not the place to consider: but before it is censured it should be thoroughly understood and well tried, and that, as nearly as may be, at the height on which Hooker followed it. And at all events he should have the credit of having really meant what he said. On the ground of some passages in his argument he is claimed as supporting one side in the very controversy from which he urged men to refrain. Against these it would be possible to set other passages which have a different look. But to dwell on such passages one way or the other is not treating Hooker as he deserves to be treated. If he had felt able or thought it right to argue either against or for belief in the external Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharistic Elements, he would have done so in the manner and on the scale he uses when he deals with other great questions, fully, frankly, laboriously, systematically: he would not earnestly and elaborately have called men away from the controversy, and then himself have crept back into it.—Those who know Hooker's ways

<sup>1</sup> V. lxvii. 6, 3, 12, 7.

and do him justice will not easily think him either so careless or so disingenuous as to break the bounds which he was strenuously appealing to other men to keep.

How much he had thought about these bounds, and how much they meant to him, appears not only by his own express statement but also indirectly.

After the publication of the Fifth Book he was bitterly attacked for this very reserve of judgement. "You seem," wrote his assailant, in the Christian Letter, "to make light of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as a matter not to be stood upon or to be contended for, cared for or enquired into : which maketh us to marvel how our Church and Reverend Fathers have all this time past been deceived. What should cause them to affirm it to be a thing contrary to the plain words of Scripture, overturning the nature of the Sacrament ; to call it monstrous doctrine ; why so many reverend Fathers, as Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, Rogers, Bradford, &c., have given their lives in witness against it, if it be a thing that neither furthereth nor hindreth, a thing not to be cared for, nor enquired after ?" In his manuscript notes for a reply to the attack Hooker quotes Bellarmine, as acknowledging of Sacraments in general, "It is a matter of faith to believe that Sacraments are instruments whereby God worketh grace in the souls of men, but the manner how He doth it is not a matter of faith." Again he writes, repeating under the attack his main thesis, "Whereas popish doctrine doth hold that priests by words of consecration make the real, my whole discourse is to show that God by the Sacrament maketh the mystical<sup>1</sup> Body of Christ : and that seeing in this point as well Lutherans as Papists agree with us, which only point containeth the benefit we have of the Sacrament, it is but needless and unprofitable for them to stand, the one upon consubstantiation, and upon transubstantiation the other, which doctrines they neither can prove nor are forced by any necessity

<sup>1</sup> The contrast which Hooker here briefly marks by the words *real* and *mystical* must be understood in the light of his fuller words in the 8th and 9th sections of this chapter, where he contrasts the belief in the Sacrament imparting to us "even in

"true and real though mystical manner the very Person of our Lord Himself," with the belief of "a literal, corporal and oral manducation of the very substance of His Flesh and Blood."

"to maintain, but might very well surcease to urge them, if they  
 "did heartily affect peace, and seek the quietness of the Church."  
 He then goes on to cite a very striking "Epistle of Frithus in the  
 "booke of Martyrs touching this point." "'Well,' said they,  
 "'dost thou not think that His very natural Body, Flesh, Blood,  
 "'and Bone, is contained under the Sacrament, and there  
 "'present, without all figure or similitude?' 'No,' said I, 'I do  
 "'not so think. *Notwithstanding I would not that any should*  
 "*count, that I make my saying, which is the negative, any article*  
 "*of faith.* For even as I say, that you ought not to make any  
 "'necessary article of the faith of your part (which is the affir-  
 "'mative), so I say again, that we make no necessary article of  
 "'the faith of our part, but leave it indifferent for all men to  
 "'judge therein, as God shall open their hearts, and no side  
 "'to condemn or despise the other, but to nourish in all things  
 "'brotherly love, and one to bear another's infirmity<sup>1</sup>."

Again, light falls on Hooker's line of teaching, and especially upon the positive aspect of it, from the thoughtful and admirable sections in which he defends his refraining of speculation against a possible charge of indolence. It might be said that such reserve as he would use and urge is a mere pretext for dullness and idleness: that it is the part of an uninterested, unquickened, listless mind thus to abstain from enquiry, and to halt at the bare fact. But in truth it is in accordance with the conduct of the Apostles at the first institution of the Eucharist. Generally they were apt to move questions: in that case they moved none: they were glad without scruple. And it is not hard to see why they were so. For this is indeed the natural bearing of a mind absorbed in the joy and delight of the fact. It is, on the other hand, generally the uncontrolled, unawed, and unappreciative mind that turns aside to ask questions and to raise difficulties. "Curious and intricate speculations do hinder, they abate, they

<sup>1</sup> Keble's Hooker, note 2 on V. lxvii. 6.—John Frith was one of the scholars brought by Wolsey to Cardinal College. In 1533 he was burnt at Smithfield, having expressly declared, "The cause why I die is this, for that I cannot agree with the divines, and other head prelates, that it should be necessarily deter-

"mined to be an article of faith, and  
 "that we should believe under pain  
 "of damnation, the substance of the  
 "bread and wine to be changed into  
 "the body and blood of our Saviour  
 "Jesus Christ, the form and shape  
 "only not being changed." Foxe, Book of Martyrs, p. 503, ed. 1563. Vol. v. pp. 4-16, ed. 1846.

"quench such inflamed motions of delight and joy as divine  
"graces use to raise when extraordinarily they are present."  
Silent acceptance is often the token of intense realization: all the  
faculties of the mind and heart being demanded and enlisted and  
engrossed by exultation in the fact itself; leaving no margin of  
attention to be inquisitive with. For a clear illustration of this  
psychological principle, Hooker sets in contrast the inquisitiveness  
of the crowd in St. John vi. as to how our Lord had got across  
the lake and the uninquisitiveness of the disciples as to how  
He had come through the closed doors after His Resurrection:  
"the one because they enjoyed not disputed, the other disputed  
"not because they enjoyed."

The Apostles then were thus by the outward Presence of the  
Risen Lord moved to a joy which lifted them above the inclina-  
tion to ask questions: what then must have been the effect upon  
them of His inward Presence, His Presence within their own  
souls?—Through stages of preliminary teaching their minds had  
been prepared for the wonder of that mystery: they had been  
taught before that His Flesh and Blood are the true cause of  
eternal life: that they are made so to be by the dignity and  
worth of His Eternal and Divine Person "which offered them  
"up by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth  
"make them still effectual thereunto": and "that to us they are  
"life in particular, by being particularly received<sup>1</sup>." These  
mysterious words were in their memories, vast but vague—  
waiting for the distinctness which only the actual experience of  
their fulfilment could give them: somewhat, it may perhaps be  
said, as descriptions of scenery are to the blind, or as general  
statements about the world are to little children. Then, being  
gathered together with Him for the Mosaic Passover, they saw  
the institution of the Rite which met, and corresponded with,  
and illumined these words: they saw Him "bless and consecrate  
"for the endless good of all generations till the world's end the  
"chosen elements of bread and wine": they were "warranted by  
"His promise that not only unto them at the present time but  
"to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly  
"administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conducts  
"of life and conveyances of His Body and Blood unto them."

<sup>1</sup> St. John vi. 33, 51, 54.

Then they knew the meaning and fulfilment of those former promises : and " a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which " they saw in themselves " absorbed them : and their bearing of concentration in delight at His entering into them, may well seem to give the best guidance and example for the thoughts of those who by the same mysteries receive the same awful and gracious Presence <sup>1</sup>.

Lastly, it may be useful to mark the commentary on Hooker's teaching afforded by the positive words of Calvin, with which he was, doubtless, thoroughly imbued, and which here and there are plainly telling on his line of thought. It will show the greatness of those truths held in common, on which Hooker would fasten men's thoughts, to bring together a few of Calvin's declarations of his belief on this point, in ch. xvii of Bk. IV of the *Institutio Christianæ Religionis*.

IV. xvii. § 5. " Sunt qui manducare Christi carnem et sanguinem eius bibere uno verbo definiunt, nihil esse aliud quam " in Christum ipsum credere. Sed mihi expressius quiddam ac " sublimius videtur voluisse docere Christus in præclara illa " concione, ubi carnis suæ manducationem nobis commendat : " nempe vera sui participatione nos vivificari ; quam manducandi etiam ac bibendi verbis ideo designavit, ne quam ab " ipso vitam percipimus, simplici cognitione percipi quispiam " putaret."

§ 11. " Dico igitur (quod et semper in ecclesia receptum fuit, " et hodie docent quicunque recte sentiunt) duabus rebus constare " sacrum cœnæ mysterium : corporeis signis, quæ ob oculos proposita, res invisibiles secundum imbecillitatis nostræ captum " nobis repræsentant ; et spirituali veritate, quæ per symbola ipsa " figuratur simul et exhibetur."

§ 14. " Nam quod dicunt (sc. veteres) in consecratione fieri " arcanam conversionem, ut iam aliud sit quam panis et vinum, " nuper admonui eo non significare, in nihilum ipsa redigi, sed " iam alio loco habenda esse quam communes cibos, qui duntaxat ad pascendum ventrem sunt destinati : quum in iis nobis " exhibeatur spiritualis animæ cibus ac potus. Id neque nos " negamus. Si conversio est, inquit isti, necesse est aliud ex

<sup>1</sup> V. lxvii. 3, 4.

" alio fieri. Si intelligunt, fieri aliquid quod prius non erat, assentior."

§ 19. " His absurditatibus (cf. infra § 32) sublatis, quidquid ad exprimendam veram substantialemque corporis ac sanguinis Domini communicationem, quæ sub sacris cœnæ symbolis fidelibus exhibetur, facere potest, libenter recipio; atque ita ut non imaginatione duntaxat aut mentis intelligentia percipere, sed ut re ipsa frui in alimentum vitæ æternæ intelligantur."

§ 24. " Dicimus Christum tam externo symbolo quam spiritu suo ad nos descendere, ut vere substantia carnis suæ et sanguinis sui animas nostras vivificet."

§ 32. " De modo si quis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, sublimius esse arcanum quam ut vel meo ingenio comprehendere, vel enarrari verbis queat: atque, ut apertius dicam, experior magis quam intelligam. Itaque veritatem Dei in qua acquiescere tuto licet, hic sine controversia amplector. Pronuntiat ille carnem suam esse animæ meæ cibum, sanguinem esse potum. Talibus alimentis animam illi meam pascendam offero. In sacra sua cœna iubet me sub symbolis panis ac vini corpus ac sanguinem suum sumere, manducare ac bibere. Nihil dubito, quin et ipse vere porrigat, et ego recipiam. Tantum absurda reiicio quæ aut cœlesti Christi maiestate indigna, aut humanæ eius naturæ veritate aliena esse apparet."

" Ea, inquam, est corporis præsentia quam sacramenti ratio postulat: quam tanta virtute tantaque efficacia hic eminere dicimus ut non modo indubitata vitæ æternæ fiduciam animis nostris afferat, sed de carnis etiam nostræ immortalitate securos nos reddat."

§ 33. " Falso iactant, quidquid docemus de spirituali manducatione veræ et reali (ut loquuntur) opponi: quandoquidem non nisi ad modum respicimus. Qui apud eos carnalis est, dum Christum pane includunt; nobis spiritualis, quia vis arcana spiritus nostræ cum Christo coniunctionis vinculum est."

And then he writes in regard to the reception of the Sacrament by the wicked:—

" Vim mysteriî integram manere dico, quantumvis impii eam, quoad in se est, exinanire studeant. Aliud tamen est offerri, aliud recipi. Spiritualem hunc cibum omnibus porrigit Christus, potumque spiritualem propinat: alii avidè vescuntur, alii fasti-

“dioso respuunt. An horum reiectio faciet ut cibus et potus  
 “suam naturam perdant? . . . Ego vero nego posse comedi  
 “absque fidei gustu; vel, si cum Augustino loqui magis placet,  
 “nego plus referre homines ex sacramento quam vase fidei colli-  
 “gunt. Ita sacramento nihil decedit: imo illibata manet eius  
 “veritas et efficacia, quamvis ab externa eius participatione inanes  
 “discedant impii. . . Hæc est sacramenti integritas, quam violare  
 “totus mundus non potest, carnem et sanguinem Christi non  
 “minus vere dari indignis quam electis Dei fidelibus; simul  
 “tamen verum est, non secus atque pluvia super duram rupem  
 “decidens effluit, quia nullus in lapidem ingressus patet, ita  
 “impios sua durtia repellere Dei gratiam quominus ad ipsos  
 “penetret. Adde quod Christum absque fide recipi nihilo  
 “magis consentaneum est quam semen in igne germinare.”

It seems worth while for two reasons thus to dwell on Calvin's positive statements in regard to the Eucharist. First, because they show the definiteness and solidity of the accord (in regard to that which is received by the Sacrament) which had attracted Hooker's attention; they show that it is no mere agreement to differ for which he pleads, but a transference of emphasis from the less to the greater, as well as from the disputed to the undisputed. Men really did agree to a large extent about that which was “the main object and scope of the Sacrament<sup>1</sup>,” and about the reality with which it was achieved by the Sacrament; in regard to this Calvin, the great prophet of the Puritans, used language as high and strong as could be needed to secure recognition for the reality and greatness of the Eucharist as a means of grace: and it is on the definite truth expressed in this language, and held in common with Lutherans and Romanists, that Hooker would insist as the primary theme for faith and teaching—not on anything vaguer or feebler or more facile. And secondly, this language is important because again and again one is struck with the likeness between the positive side of Calvin's teaching in the matter, and Hooker's own thought and language. The *Institutio* must have been to him, as to those who most told on the formation of his mind, familiar from end to end: and while he gradually but fearlessly disentangled himself from the hard and negative elements of Calvinism, he was as fearlessly and loyally

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Mozley, *Lectures and other Theological Papers*, p. 215.

clinging to the truth that was there. It is with full reliance on the strength and depth and certainty of that truth that he pleads for a reserve of speculation, a suspense of judgement, where certainty and peace seemed to him alike impossible.

From the height of the chapter which has just been considered Hooker returns to the level of controversy, to consider in detail the main objections urged by the Puritans against the manner of celebrating the Eucharist in the Church of England. He enumerates these objections, and discusses them one by one. By far the most important was the contention that those who were or had been members of the Church of Rome ought not to be admitted to the Communion "until such time as by their religious and Gospel-like behaviour they have purged themselves of that suspicion of popery which their former life and conversation hath caused to be conceived." Cartwright had maintained this contention at considerable length; and Hooker bestows on it more care than he gives to any other of the objections with which it stood.

There were really two distinct questions involved in the Puritan argument. One was the rightfulness of admitting to Communion without special examination, recantation of error, or probation those who had lived as members of the Church of Rome. The other was the rightfulness of compelling such persons to receive the Communion in the Church of England: since in admitting them to Communion freely and without question the Church of England could hardly be clear of some concurrence in the compulsion put on them.

With regard to the former of the two questions the main position taken by the Puritans gave Hooker ground for a strong and just reply. There is no need here to dwell on the abusive terms which Cartwright, in accordance with the current amenities of controversy, allowed himself to use about papists. The serious point was his assertion that they were "foreigners and strangers from the Church of God." That no time was fixed for the continuance of their probation, and no certain authority for the approval of their behaviour as Gospel-like; these were minor matters:—the grave thing was that Cartwright had adopted "the error of all popish definitions" of the Church: which "define not the Church by that which the Church essentially is,

"but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are." It is here that Hooker meets him, by maintaining that belief concerning the Church which has already been considered in connexion with the Third Book. "*Church* is a word which art hath devised thereby to sever and distinguish that society of men which professthe true religion from the rest which profess it not. There have been in the world from the very first foundation thereof but three religions:"—Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity. "Seeing then that *the Church* is a name which art hath given to *professors of true religion*," . . . "he that will teach what *the Church* is shall never rightly perform the work whereabout he goeth, till *in matter of religion* he touch that difference which severeth the Church's religion from theirs who are not the Church." And "because the *only object* which separateth ours from other religions is JESUS Christ, in Whom none but the Church doth believe and Whom none but the Church doth worship, we find that accordingly the Apostles do every where distinguish hereby the Church from infidels and from Jews, accounting 'them which call upon the name of our 'Lord JESUS Christ to be His Church.'" The amplitude of this definition Hooker then goes on to qualify by that important distinction on which stress has been already laid: the distinction between "the fellowship of sound and sincere believers" and those who, by hypocrisy, wickedness, schism, or heresy (short of plain apostasy) have "gone out" from that fellowship and left the "very true Church of Christ," and severed themselves from the "well-spring of our happiness," although they have "not altogether left nor forsaken simply the Church upon the main foundations whereof they continue built, notwithstanding these breaches whereby they are *rent at the top* asunder<sup>1</sup>."

Here then is the mistake of the Puritans on this point: they have suffered "indignation at the faults of the Church of Rome to blind and withhold their judgements from seeing that which withal they should acknowledge, concerning so much nevertheless still due to the same Church, as to be held and reputed a part of the house of God, a limb of the visible Church of Christ<sup>2</sup>." Those who have lived in the Roman Communion are members of Christ's Church: and the Church of England must

<sup>1</sup> V. lxviii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxviii. 9.

recognize and deal with them as such. With regard to the responsibility for defending the Holy Communion from sacrilegious use by those Romanists who, under the pressure of the Acts of Uniformity, sought it simply to escape the penalties of the law, Hooker's language may be thought open, at some points, to adverse criticism. The question, indeed, about such compulsion, the question of a tolerant respect for the conscience of individuals, had not been raised. Cartwright would not have been tender here. "Of papists and atheists" he had written,—“the Church having nothing to do with such, the magistrate ought to see that they join to hear the sermons in the place where they are made, whether it be in those parishes where there is a church, and so preaching, or where else he shall think best, and cause them to be examined how they profit; and, if they profit not, to punish them; and, as their contempt groweth, so to increase the punishment, until such times as they declare manifest tokens of unrepentantness; and then, as rotten members, that do not only no good nor service in the body, but also corrupt and infect others, cut them off<sup>1</sup>.” But apart from the question of the law's intolerance there was the question of the Church's responsibility for discipline in the administration of the Sacrament<sup>2</sup>. It was a question in regard to which the Puritans stood on a strong ground of truth: and it is no adequate position of defence to say that if recusants “receive our Communion, they give us the strongest pledge of fidelity that man can demand”:—that “neither doth God thus bind us to dive into men's consciences, nor can their fraud or deceit hurt any man but themselves. To Him they seem such as they are, but to us they must be taken for such as they seem”:—or that, if they in submission to the law seek Communion, and the Church rejects them “till their gospel-like behaviour be allowed,” then “after that our own simplicity hath once thus fairly eased them from sting of law, it is to be thought they will learn the

<sup>1</sup> T. C. i. p. 51, quoted in Whitgift's Defence, i. 386.—The passage may recall that “bad business of the Sermon” described in Browning's Holy-Cross Day.

<sup>2</sup> It may be marked that Whitgift says, “I do not allow that papists,

“being notoriously known, and continuing in their popery, should be admitted to receive the Communion; neither are they admitted thereunto in this Church.” Defence, iii. 103.

"mystery of gospel-like behaviour when leisure serveth them<sup>1</sup>." Doubtless, in a time following on great changes, a time when men's sense of the profound seriousness in God's sight of passing from one communion to another had been impaired by the experience of revulsions such as came with Mary's reign and with Elizabeth's, a time of transition and discord and plots, a time when "the moderate severity" of legal penalties was generally if not universally regarded as a natural method of securing religious uniformity, there was a real and manifold difficulty in duly remembering the supreme importance of sincerity and going below the outward profession or act which might be but the veil of mixed or worldly motives. Hard and blundering and inquisitorial and harmful things would often have been done by way of searching into the reality of a professed conformity; and many would have set up unwarranted and arbitrary tests of soundness in the faith. The enquiry and probation which Cartwright demanded before the admission of a recusant to the Eucharist may have been difficult and perilous, if not practically impossible. But Hooker seems to show, in answering the demand, some lack of sensitiveness to what really was amiss: and it might be hard to defend him against the charge which many good men have had to bear: the charge of having faltered somewhat from that fineness and justice of discernment which very few can keep with perfect integrity in times of trouble and conflict and confusion.

#### J. Chapters *lxi*–*lxxii*.

In the Puritan Book of Discipline it was briefly decided, "*Festi dies sunt commodè abolendi*:" a decision which Bancroft renders "*Holy Days* (as we term them) *must be abolished, commodè, as they may handsomely*<sup>2</sup>." The arguments sustaining the Puritan objection to the festivals of the Church were mainly that they had been kept by the Papists and misused by the Jews, and that they were entangled with superstition; and, more particularly, that they concentrated on some days in the year the thoughts which should be at all times cherished<sup>3</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup> V. *lxviii*, 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Dangerous Positions*, III. x. p. 95. Cf. *infra*, App. III.

<sup>3</sup> "The observing of the feast of  
"Easter for certain days in the year  
"doth pull out of our minds or ever

that their appointment infringed on the right given to men by the Fourth Commandment to work for six days in the week.

Hooker's answers to these last two arguments are interesting. But the most remarkable part of what he has to say in this section of his work is the preliminary discussion in Chapter lxix. It is one of the passages which brought on him the complaint of the *Christian Letter*, that he indulged himself in speculative doctrines and diverse theories "not so familiar to us common Christians": but it is also one of the passages which illustrate his habit of thinking out the depth of a thing to the best of his power before he answered even superficial criticisms on it.

He is concerned to show how one day or one portion of time can be said to differ from another: and he begins, according to his frequent practice in approaching a fresh subject, by going down to the fundamental ideas of time, and asking what time is, and how it is divided and marked off: further precluding confusion and making clear the field of his inquiry by showing what time is not, and what distinctions its portions do not really receive.

God alone is eternal, without beginning or end, having "continuance wherein there groweth no difference by addition of "hereafter unto now." All things besides God have their limit before which they did not exist, and also "have continually "through continuance the time of former continuance lengthened." Thus in the very nature of created things the ground is prepared for the conception of measurable and divisible continuance: it belongs necessarily to the existence of a being that once was not, that began to be: for continuance of existence must be measured, in the case of such a being, from that point of its beginning.

The first created beings to receive the impulse of their continuance out of God's eternity are the angels, continuing perpetually. From their perpetuity the heavenly bodies receive the impulse of their movement: the thread of that movement and the thread of time are spun together: that is to say, the

"we be aware the doctrine of the Gospel, and causeth us to rest in that near consideration of our duties for the space of a few days,

"which should be extended to all our life." T. C. i. 152, quoted in Keble's *Hooker*, V. lxxi. 1, note 1.

measuring points of time are the stages which appear in the movements of the heavens.

In itself time is the flowing on of that instant at which those movements began: in union with other created things it is the quantity of their continuance: that quantity being, in the case of each created thing, measured by the stages through which the heavenly bodies move between its beginning and its end. Thus the idea of things that began to be is essential to the idea of time: for without a beginning of continuance there can be no quantity, no more or less of continuance, no length or shortness. The idea of motion is not essential to the idea of time: because there may be both continuance and quantity of continuance in things that rest. But for the definite measure of the quantity of continuance, that is to say, for the measure of time, motion is necessary: and for this measuring serves the motion of the heavenly bodies, marking out the days and years.

The motion by which are measured the portions of time is circular: and therefore the stages of that motion, the positions of the moving bodies (since they move with uniform speed) must be recurrent: so that the portions of time which men mark and designate by them must recur: and that which by this method of designation is called the same time must come again and again. But it must be remembered that time is a mere quantity of continuance: and that in itself it neither imparts nor receives any quality. When men speak of it as eating or fretting out all things, or of days as happy or miserable, they are transferring to time what properly belongs to things in time: "yea, the very "opportunities which we ascribe to time do in truth cleave to "the things themselves wherewith time is joined."

It is in this way that certain times or portions of time are advanced, and marked for man to honour: to wit, because they have been conjoined with extraordinary manifestations of God's goodness. He is in all places, yet does not give to all the same holiness: so also He works in all times, yet does not give to all the same dignity. His extraordinary Presence hallows some places: His extraordinary works hallow some days. He has chosen and sanctified some days, even as He has blessed and exalted and sanctified and appropriated unto Himself some among the sons of men. And thus it is that to the religious

mind one day differs from another: the difference being made by the distinctive character of the divine acts connected with the day, and commemorated on it as it recurs in the recurring cycle of the year.

The hallowing of particular days, then, is a token of thankfulness for those manifestations of God's goodness which are associated with them: and it can be shown only in the actions which are conjoined with the days as they recur: since it is only thus that any quality at all can be attached to a day, time in itself admitting no alteration in character. The actions of religious joy are those in which such hallowing of a day will naturally be expressed—the actions of praising God, of bountifully refreshing and helping men, and of rest, as in the happiness of attained desire—not idleness (which is the renunciation of duty for fear of pain), but either the ceasing from a perfect work, or the passing to a higher labour;—the giving over “a meaner labour, because a worthier and better is to be undertaken.” Such rest, thanksgiving, and liberality are the natural elements of that rejoicing which befits those days that are linked with special instances of divine mercy.

In answer to the objection that such observance of particular days tells against the duty of constantly remembering God's mercy Hooker draws a just distinction. “That which the Gospel of Christ requireth is the perpetuity of virtuous duties; “not perpetuity of exercise or action but disposition perpetual, “and practice as oft as times and opportunities require”—it binds men *ad semper velle*, but not *ad semper agere*. “Duties of “all sorts must have necessarily their several successions and “seasons<sup>1</sup>.” The special exercise of thanksgiving at special times stands in no sort of opposition to the perpetual temper and will of thankfulness, but is its natural manner of expression and the means of sustaining and increasing it. It is unreal, it is ignoring the constitution of human nature and the facts and conditions of human life, to say that the duties which the Church attaches to festivals should, as being of perpetual obligation, be perpetually kept up: they could not be so, save by the extrusion of other duties which also have their appropriate times of exercise. The temper and will which they express should never die out of the

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxi. 2.

heart: the acts in which that temper and will find utterance should never fail when in due season opportunity is given.

In meeting the objection that "the Lord hath left it to all men "at liberty that they might labour if they think good six days," and that the Church has no right to abridge that liberty by appointing Holy Days, Hooker at once takes up the ground which he has vindicated in the First Book and, more briefly, in the third of his axioms at the beginning of the Fifth Book: the ground of the divine sanction of Human Laws within their proper sphere of authority: the ground that "the Church being a body "which dieth not hath always power, as occasion requireth, no "less to ordain that which never was, than to ratify what hath "been before<sup>1</sup>." The Puritan contention would have proved a great deal too much: for no positive precepts of men can be given "without some abridgement of their liberty to whom they "are given." "Those things which the law of God leaveth "arbitrary and at liberty are all subject unto positive laws of "men, which laws for the common benefit abridge particular "men's liberty in such things as far as the rules of equity will "suffer. This we must either maintain, or else overturn the "world and make every man his own commander<sup>2</sup>." The Fourth Commandment bound men to keep holy the seventh day: it left the other six days clear from any such obligation; it left men free to use them all for work. But this freedom is not exempt from subjection to such positive laws as societies of men, whether civil or spiritual, may, using the authority which God's providence has given them, enact: such laws as those which the Church has framed for the observance of festivals: and "as "becometh them that follow with all humility the ways of peace, "we honour, reverence, and obey in the very next degree unto "God the voice of the Church of God wherein we live<sup>3</sup>."

In close connexion with the observance of festivals, Hooker treats the discipline of Fasts. There is between them more than a superficial affinity: for they are linked in the unity of the Church's care for the training of character. "Considering that "they which grieve and joy as they ought cannot possibly otherwise live than as they should, the Church of Christ, the most "absolute and perfect school of all virtue, hath by the special

<sup>1</sup> V. viii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxxi. 4.

<sup>3</sup> V. lxxi. 7.

"direction of God's good Spirit hitherto always inured men  
"from their infancy partly with days of festival exercise for the  
"framing of the one affection, and partly with times of a contrary  
"sort for the perfecting of the other." But it would be a poor  
and unworthy view of fasting to regard it only as keeping men's  
feelings in order and taming the tumult of them. It has its  
Godward aspect: it is among the ways of utterance for man's  
highest life, expressing now the reality of self-humiliation and  
sorrow for sin, now "the serious intention of our minds fixed on  
"heavenlier and better desires, the earnest hunger and thirst  
"whereof depriveth the body of those usual contentments, which  
"otherwise are not denied unto it<sup>1</sup>."

There seems little in Hooker's chapter concerning Fasts that is  
difficult or obscure<sup>2</sup>, and though there are in it many sentences  
of singular justice and suggestiveness<sup>3</sup>, there is not much that  
needs special notice here. But it is a good illustration of his  
method; showing first the ground in nature for that which he  
defends: then the extent and the limits of its scriptural sanction:  
then the ancient and continuous use of it in the Christian Church,  
under the authority committed to the Church for instituting and  
ordaining such observances: then, for the better illustration and  
commendation of the Church's use of fasts, their misuse or dis-  
paragement and condemnation by heretics: and then, briefly,  
the wisdom and duty of tempering by equity, in regard to men's  
necessities, the rule of such ordinances, seeing that they "are  
"ordinances well devised for the good of man, and yet not man  
"created purposely for them as for other offices of virtue where-  
"unto God's immutable law for ever tieth<sup>4</sup>."

It is interesting to notice how heartily Hooker enters into that  
desire for the restitution of the primitive Church discipline which  
is expressed in the Preface to the Communion Service<sup>5</sup>. For  
he writes with warmth and earnestness: and his words illustrate  
the real and widely felt anxiety to which allusion has been  
already made<sup>6</sup>, the anxiety for a revival of discipline in the

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxii. 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup> The slight obscurity in § 9 may  
be cleared up by comparing St.  
Augustine's words in note 3 on § 8,  
with Cartwright's criticism in note 1  
on § 1.

<sup>3</sup> Especially the fine passage on  
the place of Christian discipline in  
training the soldierly character, § 17.

<sup>4</sup> V. lxxii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> V. lxxii. 13, 14.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 14.

Church of England. The Puritans were right in pleading for a higher standard and a stricter exercise of discipline: but they were not alone in desiring it: and probably it is not unjust to say that, however good their intentions may have been, their agitation for their own narrow scheme of the "Holy Discipline,"—involving nothing less than a complete recasting of the constitution and polity of the Church,—was one of the causes which made it hard to attain that restoration of order and dutifulness for which many of their opponents longed as earnestly as they did.

*K. Chapters lxxiii-lxxv.*

Three short chapters are given to answering the objections alleged by the Puritans against the forms of Service for the Solemnization of Matrimony, the Churching of Women, and the Burial of the Dead. Most of the objections bore on points which had no necessary relation to any great principle, save only that of the Church's power to decree rites and ceremonies:—and Hooker's arguments in reply are not greatly laboured: they move for the most part on the level of the criticisms which they meet. There is thus but little to dwell on in this section of his work: though there is considerable interest in his short delineation of the nature and dignity of marriage<sup>1</sup>.

*L. Chapters lxxvi-lxxx.*

In this last section of the Fifth Book Hooker has before him the objections of the Puritans to certain points in the form of Ordination and the discipline of the Clergy. It appears that he had already written the Seventh Book<sup>2</sup>: and accordingly much that is cognate to the subjects of this section is to be read there and not here. But within the narrower range which he here allows himself there are passages of great importance.

Such pre-eminently is the first chapter of the section, in which his main theme is the service which the Ministry renders to society at large, even in regard to the welfare of this life:—his main aim, to show how "the priest is a pillar of that common-

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxiii. 1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. V. lxxx. 13.

"wealth wherein he faithfully serveth God<sup>1</sup>." With strength and clearness he sets forth the truth that all forms of earthly welfare, all temporal blessings, all the good things that men may both naturally and rightly desire in this world, are not reasonably to be sought for their own sake, but "with reference and relation "to somewhat independently good." "They are no such good "as wherein a right desire doth ever stay or rest itself": nature itself teaches that they are to be sought for the sake of those actions which besee man's excellency—for "the exercise of "virtue and the speculation of truth<sup>2</sup>"—it is as serviceable and contributory to these ends that they evince their true meaning and value. In themselves they are only the matter, they lack the form of happiness:—the form which they receive only in their right use. Their quality is distorted and reversed in their misuse: they are in truth enjoyed only by those who, having them, "*esteem them according to that they are in their own nature.*"—And this is what religion teaches and enables men to do: it is the key to the true worth of the blessings of this life: it shows men how to think of them and use them, and find the real good of them. Those who thrust aside religion may have the utmost wealth of the raw material for happiness and make nothing of it: for they fail to see God's goodness in it, and seeking or cherishing as supreme what essentially is subordinate, they throw their whole life out of gear. Whatever men may have, those only who think and live religiously can really enjoy welfare.—Yet even more than this may be said. For there is in religion a power to attract welfare, to draw prosperity into a life: that is its tendency (to transfer a phrase of Hooker's from another context) accordingly to God's general and antecedent Will: and it is a real tendency, howsoever it may be modified or checked in particular instances, by His consequent and occasioned Will. Hooker marks very finely the great groups of conditions which may well make adversity or a restricted, stinted prosperity the truest blessing of a religious life:—men's minds are out of order and God knows the treatment that they need: their best wealth is that which best suits their place and task in life, since proportionate implements

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxvi. 1.

<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to notice how frequently in this part of his argument, where he is concerned with a truth

of natural Ethics, Hooker recalls or refers to the language of Aristotle and of Euripides.

are better than huge: the accumulation or continuance of all the elements of secular welfare would be unnatural: and "true felicity consisteth in the highest operations of that nobler part of man which sheweth sometime greatest perfection not in using the benefits which delight nature but in suffering what nature can hardliest endure." All these things are true, and they cover a very large part of the whole field of human life: but they do not destroy, though they may constantly counteract, the natural affinity between religion and prosperity:—the affinity which is attested by the Bible, and by men's "unfeigned confessions drawn from the very heart of experience." "This peculiar benefit, this singular grace and pre-eminence religion hath, that either it guardeth as an heavenly shield from all calamities, or else conducteth us safe through them, and per-mitteth them not to be miseries<sup>1</sup>." Religion naturally tends to welfare: and, whether that tendency prevail or is traversed, religion so makes clear and possible the right use, whether it be of prosperity or of adversity, that both alike yield their peaceable and blessed fruit.

When thus the power of religion in this world is seen, the place of the Ministry and its service in the Commonwealth will appear. For "without the work of the Ministry religion by no means can possibly continue." This Hooker treats as a proposition needing no proof or argument. He might indeed have claimed for it a vast weight of confirmation from the sources to which he is wont to turn: from Scripture, from antiquity, from the wide consent and experience of men. But the argument which he suggests, as that which he would have followed out had he thought it necessary, is an argument from the analogy of God's general way in the bestowal of His bounty. His institution of a Ministry in His Church for the dispensation of His grace is analogous to the order He has impressed upon the world for the dispensation of His gifts in nature. "All things which are of God He hath by wonderful art and wisdom sodered as it were together with the glue of mutual assistance<sup>2</sup>, appointing the lowest to receive from the nearest to themselves what the influence of the highest yieldeth. And therefore the Church being the most absolute of all His works was in reason to be

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxvi. 5, 6, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I. iii. 5.

"also ordered with like harmony, that what He worketh might no less in grace than in nature be effected by hands and instruments duly subordinated unto the power of His own Spirit<sup>1</sup>."

Thus the Ministry stands in the Commonwealth as God's ordinary provision for the regular maintenance and communication of that light and strength whereby men are enabled so to think and live as to receive from God, if it be for their good, the blessing of prosperity, and to use either prosperity or adversity in the right and fruitful way of happiness<sup>2</sup>.

It was probably the thought of the thankless and contemptuous language often used about the Clergy that set Hooker's mind dwelling thus specially on this aspect of the Ministry. It is an aspect which, regarded as he displays it, covers a wide field: and the more his words about it are considered, the less likely it is to be judged an earth-bound or utilitarian view. To bear about among men the clue for discovering, the strength for realizing in prosperity and in adversity the blessings which are hidden in both, is surely no poor account of one large part, at least, in the work of the Ministry. But Hooker does not forget that there are other parts: contemplation, and the leading of those acts of praise and worship which rise to God from His Church:—these he mentions as essentially linked with that service of man which he has, for whatever reason, unfolded and presented at greater length. (1) Contemplation  
(2) Adoration

He goes on to speak of the power given to men for the work of the Ministry: and in speaking of it he shows that side of his mind and character which makes the traditional epithet "judicious" seem somewhat cold and inadequate. Judicious indeed he was: but there were thoughts that raised his mind and utterance to a height on which he seems as one wholly absorbed and enkindled and controlled by the objects of his contemplation: a height on which the cautious and critical procedure usually associated with the judicious type of character is superseded by the illuminating vision of great truths. And here he is thus raised by the thought which had force to interrupt the tenor of St. Paul's writing, and sway his mind into thanksgiving<sup>3</sup>: the thought of that which he himself had received and known in the gift of the Ministry. It is in a passage of extraordinary

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxvi. 9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. VII. xviii.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Tim. i. 12. Cf. Eph. iii. 7 seq.

elevation and directness that he sets forth the power conferred by the grace of ordination upon those who are God's Ministers "not only by way of subordination," as are princes and magistrates, but also because their authority is derived from Him. Indeed it is inconceivable that the power which is entrusted to the Clergy could be given save by Him. The awful words on which their mission rests sound to Hooker as "voices uttered out of the clouds above."—"The power of the Ministry of God translateth out of darkness into glory, it raiseth men from the earth and bringeth God Himself down from heaven, by blessing visible elements it maketh them invisible grace, it giveth daily the Holy Ghost, it hath to dispose of that Flesh which was given for the life of the world and that Blood which was poured out to redeem souls, when it poureth malediction upon the heads of the wicked they perish, when it revoketh the same they revive<sup>1</sup>."

It is this power<sup>2</sup> that constitutes the mark or character whereby the Clergy are distinguished and severed from other men, and made "a special order consecrated unto the service of the Most High in things wherewith others may not meddle." And this mark or character has been rightly held to be indelible: when thus men are "once consecrated unto God they are made His peculiar inheritance for ever." Suspension may stop, degradation may utterly cut off the exercise of the power conferred: but the character remains: and restitution no more requires re-ordination than the reconciliation of those who have been married and separated requires re-marriage. And thus to demand, as the Puritans wished, the re-ordination of those who had been ordained in the communion of the Church of Rome, would be to fall into an error analogous to that censured in the Luciferians by St. Jerome.

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxvii. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, III. lxiii. 2. At the beginning of § 2 in chapter lxxvii. Hooker speaks of the Clergy as those "to whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself for the knitting of both in one; (a work which antiquity doth call the

"making of Christ's body). The sentence is not without obscurity: but the present writer is inclined to think that the words in brackets refer to "the knitting of both in one"; and that by "the making of Christ's body" is meant the union of the faithful with Christ Himself, and so their gathering into the unity of His Mystical Body, by the ministry of the Holy Eucharist.

Delible  
mark.

The Puritans had vehemently objected to the use in the act of Ordination of Christ's own words "Receive the Holy Ghost." Hooker defends the use of the words first by explaining the aptness of the words "to express the heavenly wellspring of that "power which ecclesiastical ordinations do bestow": secondly, by showing that Christ Himself used the words with reference to the same power which is now given in Ordination, and that therefore His example is applicable as warranting the present use of them: and lastly, by dwelling on the justice and truth and timeliness of the words, as declaring, at the moment when men are undertaking a burden for which no man is sufficient, the reality of the strength which will sustain them. "Qui mihi "oneris est auctor, ipse mihi fiet administrationis adjutor: et ne "sub magnitudine gratiæ succumbat infirmus, dabit virtutem, qui "contulit dignitatem<sup>1</sup>." "For as much as the Holy Ghost, which "our Saviour in His first Ordinations gave, doth no less concur "with spiritual vocations throughout all ages, than the Spirit "which God derived from Moses to them that assisted him in his "government did descend from them to their successors in like "authority and place, we have for the least and meanest duties "performed by virtue of ministerial power, that to dignify, grace "and authorize them, which no other offices on earth can "challenge."

There seems to be nothing requiring special notice in the reasonable and adequate answer with which Hooker meets the Puritan censures on the practice of seeking Holy Orders: a practice in no way necessarily implying ambition: since "there "is not the least degree in this service but it may be both in "reverence shunned, and of very devotion longed for."

Hooker deals but briefly in this Book with the great questions relating to the threefold Ministry of the Church, and the rival theory of its constitution presented in the Puritan platform. The main part of what he had to say on these subjects was reserved for the Sixth and Seventh Books of his treatise. But he draws here the main lines of his position in order that he may show where he takes his stand to meet and deal with certain criticisms of the Puritans.

With regard to the distinction of degrees or orders in the

<sup>1</sup> S. Leo, Sermon i, § 2; quoted by Hooker on V. lxxvii. 8.

Ministry he points first to the analogy seen in the Jewish Church, with its distinct orders of Priests and Levites, and within the order of Priests the further distinctions of the Chief Priests and the High Priest: and then, besides these orders, those who, "indifferently out of all tribes," were from time to time called by God as Prophets, or chosen by men to be scholars of the Prophets, or scribes.

Analogously in the Christian Church there are the distinct orders of Presbyters (or Priests) and Deacons: and within the order of Presbyters a further distinction. "Of Presbyters some "were greater some less in power, and that by our Saviour's own "appointment; the greater they which received fulness of "spiritual power, the less they to whom less was granted<sup>1</sup>." The greater were the Apostles, who had received their commission by immediate revelation from Christ Himself: the less were the Seventy, and those whom afterwards the Apostles ordained to be Presbyters. And then, besides these distinctions of greater Presbyters (or Apostles), of lesser Presbyters, and of Deacons, there were distinguishing gifts or offices; which, however, did not constitute distinct orders, but marked out individual Christians, whether of the laity or of the clergy;—gifts such as those of Prophets and Evangelists, offices such as those of Pastors and Teachers. Thus by Holy Scripture "it clearly appeareth that "churches apostolic did know but three degrees in the power of "ecclesiastical order, at the first Apostles, Presbyters, and "Deacons, afterwards instead of Apostles, Bishops<sup>2</sup>."

Such is Hooker's reiterated teaching concerning the Ministry of the Church. In connexion with his presentation of it in Chapter lxxviii he treats of several points in the Puritan contention, widely diverse in importance.

The first concerns the use of the word Presbyter or the word Priest for the order which may be designated by either. Hooker's judgement is, that "in truth the word *Presbyter* doth seem "more fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than *Priest* "with the drift of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ." But most attention and criticism has been attracted by the language which he uses in maintaining that the word *Priest*, unsparingly

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 219.

<sup>2</sup> V. lxxviii. 9.

denounced by the Puritans, is not unwarranted or inapplicable. He accepts the general association of the title of a Priest with the act of sacrifice: though he points out that the association is not so universal or necessary or immediate as is sometimes implied. Still, practically, he is content to regard the terms as correlative: and so regarding them he raises the question:—"Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church Ministry, how should the name of Priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?" His answer is substantially consonant with what he teaches in the Fourth Book. "The Fathers of the Church of Christ" . . . "call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood* in regard of that which the Gospel hath *proportion-able* to ancient sacrifices, namely the Communion of the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice." In the Fourth Book he had said, "though God do now hate sacrifice, whether it be heathenish or Jewish, so that we cannot have the same things which they had but with impiety; yet unless there be some greater let than the only evacuation of the Law of Moses, the names themselves" (scil. the names of Altar, Priest, and Sacrifice) "may (I hope) be retained without sin, in respect of that proportion which things established by our Saviour have unto them which by Him are abrogated. And so throughout all the writings of the ancient Fathers we see that the words which were do continue; the only difference is, that whereas before they had a literal, they now have a metaphorical use, and are as so many notes of remembrance unto us, that what they did signify in the letter is accomplished in the truth<sup>1</sup>." The several phrases in the two passages must be read together: and so some qualification seems to be given to the negations for which Hooker has been censured by Waterland and others. The words "sacrifice is now no part of the Church Ministry" must be read in the light not only of the more guarded statement that the Gospel has "properly now no sacrifice," but also in the light of the explanatory words attached to the still stronger rejection of sacrifice in IV. xi. 10, the words "whether it be heathenish or Jewish."—Again, Hooker must be credited with attaching some real meaning to the *proportion* (of which he speaks in both passages) between what

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxviii. 2; IV. xi. 10.

was abrogated and what was established by Christ: he cannot have meant to deny utterly all sacrificial aspect or character in the Eucharist, when he speaks of it as *proportionable* to ancient sacrifices: for a merely alien rite could not be spoken of as proportionable to that which it superseded. Again, it must be borne in mind that Hooker clearly did not mean to part company with the Fathers to whom he refers: he intended his words to be at all events a possible interpretation of theirs. What he does quite deny is a sacrifice that is either "heathenish," "Jewish," or "proper": and therefore much turns on the meaning he attached to this last term.<sup>1</sup> Waterland's comment upon it is valuable: "I presume he meant by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory*, according to the *sense* of the Trent Council, or of the *new* definitions": for Hooker could indeed, in his use of the words, hardly be forgetful of the sense in which "Verum et proprium sacrificium" was used by Roman theologians. But it may well be that he had also in mind the contrast of which Waterland speaks in a note, as then recently emphasized by Hooker's friend and teacher Rainolds, who, in 1584, had "shewn that the Fathers were no friends to the *mass-sacrifice*, considered as *true* and *proper*, inasmuch as they allowed only of *spiritual* sacrifices, which, in the Romish account, were not *true* or *proper* sacrifices<sup>1</sup>." These conditions environing and telling upon Hooker's thoughts should be justly taken into account in trying to appraise his words.

There seems to be little that needs special notice in Hooker's brief but sufficient answers to the Puritan criticism on the extension of the ministry of Deacons "farther than the circuit of their labour "at the first was drawn": to their advocacy of an Order of Widows: to their censures of such "titles of office" as Deans, Prebendaries, Archdeacons, Commissaries: (titles in no way disturbing or trenching on the historic degrees of ecclesiastical order): and to their disproportionate objection to going about the world in cap and clothes of a particular shape. He touches a point of far more importance in speaking of the Puritan interpretation of 1 Cor. xii. 28, and Eph. iv. 7, 8, 11, 12. These were two of the passages used by Puritan writers, positively, to prove the distinction of Pastors and Doctors, as separate classes, and as the only

<sup>1</sup> Waterland's Works, vol. v. p. 140, note f (ed. 1856).

perpetual and ordinary ministers of the Word of God for the building-up of the Church: and negatively, against the maintenance of titles and offices not mentioned in these passages, titles and offices such as those of Archbishops and Archdeacons<sup>1</sup>. Hooker does not here discuss the somewhat arbitrary discrimination with which some of the offices enumerated in these passages were set aside by the Puritans as extraordinary and temporary, others retained and upheld as ordinary and permanent: possibly he dealt with this point in the Sixth Book, as it stood when Cranmer revised and criticized it<sup>2</sup>. Here he takes his stand on the broad, clear ground that the passages are simply inapplicable to the purpose for which they were used, and irrelevant to the question concerning which they were quoted. They had nothing to do with the distinction of orders among the Clergy, nor were they lists of distinct and incompatible offices in the Church. Questions relating to those orders and offices must be determined by reference to other parts of scripture and other considerations: these passages are expressions of the wealth with which God had, in fulfilment of His promises, enriched His Church by the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost. Those who are enumerated here are not enumerated as Church officers of different sorts or orders or degrees, but as "*Communicants of special infused grace*, for the benefit of members knit in one body, the Church of Christ": and the Apostle does not "respect what any of them were by office or power given them through ordination, but what by grace they all had obtained through miraculous infusion of the Holy Ghost." "Out of men thus endued with gifts of the Spirit upon their conversion to Christian faith the Church had her ministers chosen, unto whom was given ecclesiastical power by ordination": but "no man's gifts or qualities can make him a minister of holy things, unless ordination do give him power"<sup>3</sup>. The difference on which Hooker thus insists between special gifts on the one hand, and ecclesiastical orders on the other, seems the key to the true interpretation of the passages in question: and it had been used repeatedly by Whitgift at the same point of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. The Second Admonition to the Parliament, quoted in Keble's Hooker, on V. lxxviii. 8. Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ Explicatio, pp. 101-107. T. C. i. p. 85, quoted in

Whitgift's Defence, vol. ii. pp. 97, 98 seq.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's Hooker, vol. i. p. xxxvi; vol. iii. p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> V. lxxviii. 8, 9, 6.

controversy. So interpreted the passages give no support to the Puritan contention; and the questions relating to the three-fold ministry are left to be debated upon other grounds.

In speaking about tithes Hooker does not seem to be in close or definite conflict with the opponents whom he generally confronts. The Puritan writers do not seem to have alleged any serious objection against the endowment of religion by means of tithes: and the passages bearing on the subject in the *Ecclesiasticæ Disciplinæ Explicatio* are moderate and reasonable. The care which Hooker spends on this point may have been prompted partly by a desire to bring out the iniquity of plundering the Church, and partly by his indignation against those of whom he speaks more than once<sup>1</sup> as using the Puritan agitation with a hypocritical profession of admiration for the state of Apostolic poverty, and with a secret hope of enriching themselves in the process of reducing the Church to that state.—There is not much that is difficult or noteworthy in the chapter devoted to answering the objections repeatedly urged by the Puritans against the ordination of any for whom there was not a definite place vacant and a definite charge provided: and Hooker defers to the Seventh Book the important question of popular election as a requisite preliminary to ordination. But some points of great interest come into view in the last chapter of the book, where he treats of the compromises or concessions or dispensations by which the prevalent difficulties of the day or the demands of special cases were wont to be met; the ordination of incompetent men, the sanction given to non-residence, and the accumulation of benefices, being especially brought under consideration.

Probably few will read the chapter without some feeling of disappointment: and it cannot be denied that there are passages in it which warrant the feeling. Dean Church spoke of Hooker as appearing "to write from a point of view to "which the religious compromises of Elizabeth's reign wore the "aspect of an absolute and unimprovable ideal<sup>2</sup>." He truly adds that nothing could be further from his principles. But yet it seems to be some such impediment of his mind that checks or

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Preface, ch. iv; Epistle Dedicatory, § 8, and V. lxxix. 17; and also VII. xxiii. 11.

<sup>2</sup> R. W. Church: Hooker, Bk. I., Introduction, p. xvi.

confuses his insight at certain points where one would have expected him to be clear and thorough. The main lines of his contention and the principles and convictions which determine them are sound: it is in the extent to which he would approve the use of that exceptional treatment which he rightly vindicates from sweeping censure, and in the tone of some incidental expressions concerning it, that he lies open to criticism<sup>1</sup>. It is a jarring argument that because not "a fourth part of the livings "with cure... are able to yield sufficient maintenance for learned "men," therefore "there is no remedy but to take into the "ecclesiastical order a number of men meanly qualified in respect "of learning": or that if an incumbent is non-resident for three years out of nine, and spends that time in study at the University, he is likely to do more good in the remaining six years than he would have been able to do in nine years with his poverty of learning unremedied: or that leave of non-residence should be given to noblemen's chaplains because of their good effect upon "the orderly courses and motions of those greater orbs," and "to "the end they (*scil.* noblemen and princes) may love that religion "the more which no way seeketh to make them vulgar, no way "diminisheth their dignity and greatness, but to do them good "doth them honour also, and by such extraordinary favours "teacheth them to be in the Church of God the same which the "Church of God esteemeth them, more worth than thousands." Nor is it satisfactory to find Hooker apparently quite content that "the brethren and sons of lords temporal or of knights, if "God shall move the hearts of such to enter at any time into "holy orders, may obtain to themselves a faculty or license to "hold two ecclesiastical livings though having cure, any spiritual "person of the Queen's Council three such livings, her chaplains "what number of promotions herself in her own princely wisdom "thinketh good to bestow upon them." It is impossible to refrain from wishing that Hooker had not written these passages: and it seems right to quote them here because stress has been laid in this Introduction upon the words and acts in which he appears at his best, and does justice to what he really was. If in such words as have just been cited he seems to lapse from the true standpoint for a faithful and unworldly and spiritually-

<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed that he makes some amends in VII. xxiv. 2-12.

mindful man, if here and there he says what is poor and what may easily be represented as cynical or cringing, the lapse may not be ignored. Such excessive deference in the things of the Church to the distinctions of the world has often given just and deep offence, in many generations since Hooker's: it would be hard to measure how far it has obscured the spiritual reality of the Church, and alienated those for whom the Church's eager and disinterested care should have been, as in Christ's day, high among the tokens of His truth: it has lodged in many hearts, both of rich and poor, false, perplexing thoughts which years of faithful toil and teaching cannot eradicate: it has stayed the presence of Christ, the realization of the supernatural, from overwhelming, as with a sweeping tide of unearthly light, the cramping barriers that rank or money has set up. It is a serious indictment against Hooker that he faltered here, and that his great authority could be pleaded in defence of things that no one now would try to defend. But it would be unjust to estimate his fault without taking into account the conditions which may have made it almost inconceivably hard to see and hold the true line in such matters. It is often difficult to maintain a necessary and rational patience in regard to what is amiss and seems at the time incurable, without some loss of sensitiveness to it: and Hooker may have been pushed a little towards an undue patience by the impracticable, irresponsible proposals of the Puritans for dealing with what they saw to be wrong<sup>1</sup>. Again, he wrote in an age when excessive deference to great people was very generally expected and rendered: and he himself was by temperament inclined to deference, scrupulous in his regard for authority, an enthusiast for order. Moreover, he was a shy man, loving a quiet, retired life, and even then easily abashed: and it may well be that he thought of the great world and those who shone in it with a child-like sense of remoteness and alarm which he was not self-conscious enough to disguise. But above all else that may be said in extenuation of Hooker's excess in admiration for the existing state of affairs, in widening the range of privilege, in urging deference to "principal personages," there is this;—that he himself never profited and never came into the suspicion of desiring to profit by any of these things: and if there

<sup>1</sup> Cf. V. lxxxi. 3, 12, 13, 14.

be now and then a sound of worldliness in some phrases that he used, the purity of his unworldly life remained unsullied and undisputed.

The main lines of his argument in this last chapter of the Fifth Book are, as has been said, sound and clear. They bring to bear on the allowance in the Ministry of some who could not preach, of some who were not resident, of some who held several benefices at once, the Fourth Axiom, as enunciated and explained in the Ninth Chapter of this Book. Concerning the general principles which required that Ministers should be apt to teach and preach, that they should live among and for the flock committed to them, that they should not by a plurality of benefices add the scandal of covetousness to the evil of non-residence, Hooker speaks with thorough plainness and strength; nor is he reserved in his condemnation of those who outraged and contemned these principles, "without either care or conscience of the "public good." "Let no man spare to tell it them, they are not "faithful towards God that burden wilfully His Church with such "swarms of unworthy creatures<sup>1</sup>." So far he goes with the Puritans. What he maintains against them is that in deference to necessity, in the dearth of learned men and preachers, exceptions may be allowed to the first of these principles, and, lest "the greatest part of the people should be left utterly without the public use and exercise of religion," some ordained who do not come up to what is undoubtedly the proper standard: and that, for the sake of public utility<sup>2</sup>, dispensation may be granted in some cases, (cases such as those above indicated,) from the obligation of the second and third principle: such exceptions, dispensations, and privileges not being, as the Puritans held, contrariant or repugnant to the general principle or law, but dealing really with a different subject-matter: dealing, that is to say, with a particular and concrete case, while the law stands unfringed, declaring what is right in the abstract and in general. In the latter case the matter is *indefinitely* considered, in the former it is considered as *beset and limited with special circumstances*. And thus, as Hooker had written in the earlier chapter on this subject, "many privileges, immunities, exceptions, and "dispensations, have been always with great equity and reason

<sup>1</sup> V. lxxx. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. V. ix. I, ad finem.

“granted; not to turn the edge of justice, or to make void at  
“certain times and in certain men, through mere voluntary  
“grace or benevolence, that which continually and universally  
“should be of force, (as some understand it,) but in very  
“truth to practise general laws according to their right  
“meaning<sup>1</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> V. ix. 3.

## CHAPTER VI.

### *The Sequel of the Fifth Book.*

(i) THE Fifth Book appeared in 1597. Two years later, in 1599, a short and anonymous tract was published under the cumbrous title of "A Christian Letter of certaine English "Protestants, unfained favourers of the present state of Religion, "authorised and professed in England: unto that Reverend and "learned man, Mr. R. Hoo. requiring resolution in certain "matters of doctrine (which seeme to overthrow the foundation "of Christian Religion, and of the Church among us) expresslie "contained in his five books of *Ecclesiasticall Pollicie*." The tract bears no printer's name: it consists of forty-nine small quarto pages. It is not remarkable for depth of thought, strength of argument, or lucidity of expression. But that in Hooker's day it seemed important is clear from more than one source. It was reported that it so wounded him "that it was not the least cause "to procure his death<sup>1</sup>": and though the report seems improbable when the tract is read, incongruous with Hooker's tone about it, and contradicted by a trustworthy witness<sup>2</sup>, it shows that in some quarters the attack was thought to be serious. It was also said that the tract had been "translated into other "tongues": though Covell, when he was answering it, had certainly not seen any translation of it. But there is stronger evidence of the importance attached to it in the fact that three years after Hooker's death Covell published an answer to it, dedicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>3</sup>: and stronger still

<sup>1</sup> W. Covell, A just and temperate defence of the five books of Ecclesiasticall Pollicie written by Mr. Richard Hooker.—Preface, to the Reader.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Covell, in the Preface cited above.

<sup>3</sup> Printed in full in the 2nd vol. of Hanbury's Edition of Hooker.

in this, that Hooker during the last year of his life was preparing to reply to it somewhat fully.

The tract has never, so far as the present writer is aware, been re-published: but considerable portions of it appear in the notes to Keble's edition of Hooker, and the whole is to be found in scattered fragments up and down the notes in Hanbury's edition. In either of these two editions the fragments will show the criticisms of the Letter at the points to which they relate, and will serve as samples of its style. But it may be well to attempt here some estimate of its general character.

In spite of much that is exaggerated and blundering the tract seems to convey an anxiety that is genuine and, from a certain point of view, reasonable. The standpoint claimed is that of "unfained favourers of the present state of religion, authorised and "professed in England": but it may be doubted whether this claim was quite whole-hearted: since in one passage the writer speaks expressly of the Genevan Discipline as founded by "the Lord "Christ, the Author and Builder of His Church<sup>1</sup>." Probably the tract represents the feeling of those who were content to conform themselves publicly to "the present state of religion," while privately they looked forward to and worked towards a system more closely resembling that of Geneva; hoping, in Fuller's phrase, "to set up a Discipline in a Discipline, Presbytery in "Episcopacy<sup>2</sup>," and putting up with the English Reformation as an instalment or earnest of a more thorough and radical change, such as might constitute a complete break with the past. To those who were so minded, or nearly so minded, Hooker's position, when they came to understand it, was likely to be profoundly disquieting and ominous. For Hooker saw, and forced them to suspect, that the English Church had carried through the process of reformation far more than they were ready to accept: and that the unwelcome strands (so to speak) of continuous character and history were likely to tell more and not less in the life of the Church as time went on. Much of the ancient tradition of the Church, of its undiminished heritage, was already explicit

<sup>1</sup> P. 38. Hooker notices the inconsistency. "Here," he writes, "you "are plain and content openly to "show yourself a disciplinarian."

<sup>2</sup> Church History, Book ix. § 5, p. 142. Cf. Keble's Preface to Hooker, xxiv. § 8.

in Hooker's teaching: and somewhat more was implicit, waiting for fuller developement in clearer air and quieter times: and those who had looked hopefully to see Calvinism take root and cover the land were reasonably apprehensive when they began to see not only that the elements which Calvinism could not assimilate were greater and stronger than Calvinists had thought, but that they were likely to prove the vital and characteristic forces of the future. It is not in Hooker only, but in the line of like-minded Anglican theologians who took up and carried forward Hooker's work, that the full warrant may be found for the apprehension evinced in the *Christian Letter*. The continuity of the English Church and the wealth of its heritage from the past are the solid and insuperable facts which rise with discouraging steadiness before "certain English Protestants" as they study Hooker's five books: and they feel that "this moderate kind of reformation which the Church of England hath taken" has in truth preserved and purified and strengthened that ancient order, discipline, and ceremonial which they had hoped to see the end of. Briefly, they had been aware of two currents in the Elizabethan Church: they were now aware that the current they disliked was the main stream, and growing in volume, strength, and clearness.

Thus the apprehension shown in the *Christian Letter* was genuine and warranted. But the indignation in which it expressed itself was misdirected: the real quarrel of the writer, whether he knew it or not, was not with Hooker, but with the English Church. It was a mere blunder to say that Hooker was "covertly and underhand," bending "all his skill and force against the present state of the English Church," and, "by colour of defending the Discipline and Government thereof," making questionable and bringing into contempt the Doctrine of Faith itself<sup>1</sup>: and he was amply justified in resenting the language that "traduced him as an underminer." Later and more dispassionate ages have rightly recognized his loyalty to the cause he professed, and he has even been regarded as "the representative man of the Church of England<sup>2</sup>." The real warrant for his assailant's alarm lay in the principles which that

<sup>1</sup> A *Christian Letter*, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S. R. Gardiner, *History of England*, i. 40.

Church had carried safely through the work of reformation and which were to prove the secret of its distinctive strength and character in Christendom. At point after point Hooker is challenged in the tract to show the conformity of his teaching "unto the Articles of Religion set forth Anno Domini 1562, and confirmed by Parliament the 13th of Her Majesty's most blessed and joyful reign, and unto the Apologies of such Reverend Fathers and Chief Pillars of our Church, as from time to time since the Gospel began to shine among us, have written and preached, and every way laboured to advance and defend the same, with the Liturgy and Church government established among us<sup>1</sup>." But when the points at issue are got clear from confusion and misunderstanding and misrepresentation, when the questions are carried beneath the mere contrast of phrase with phrase to the realities of thought and belief which the phrases were meant to express, what discrepancy there is will be found rather between Hooker and the "Reverend Fathers and Chief Pillars" selected by his assailant than between Hooker and the formularies of the Church. And it is most significant that the angriest and by far the largest section in the tract is devoted to a bitter denunciation of Hooker's treatment of Calvin<sup>2</sup>. In this, and in matters kindred to or involved in this, lay the chief and most intractable offence of the five books. The Church of England owed no deference to Calvin or to Geneva, and was not to be guided in its course by the examples of reformation or the opinions of reformers on the continent. This was clear; and Hooker saw and said it clearly; and those who wished to live as English Churchmen while their hearts were set on Swiss ideas were not unnaturally frightened and annoyed.

The writer of the "Christian Letter" must have been a dull man<sup>3</sup>. Next to Hooker's independent criticism of Calvin what

<sup>1</sup> P. 5. Cf. p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> "What moved you to make choice of that worthy pillar of the Church above all other, to traduce him and to make him a spectacle before all christians"? . . . "Open unto us without deceit ingenuously, whether all the learned of our country, who have written and disputed for discipline, be not too base and mean persons, that on them

"only so mighty a man should spend his sharp arrows and coals of juniper? but you will pass over the seas, and search the sepulchres of the strangers, and finding no man alive worthy your combat, you call Master Calvin out of his sweet bed of rest, and him that is entered into peace, you challenge again into the field." pp. 37, 38.

<sup>3</sup> Dull enough sometimes to over-

seems to have vexed him most was the width of general reading and the wealth of thought and style shown in the treatise: and the last few pages of his tract are devoted to a strange, querulous, rambling indictment on this score<sup>1</sup>. He does not seem likely to have meant to misrepresent either Hooker or the writers whom he cites on his own side: yet he does it<sup>2</sup>. But for all his deficiencies, Hooker thought it well to answer him: and parts of his preparation for the task are extant, in two forms.

(ii) In the Library of Corpus Christi College there is a little volume of great value and interest, which the present writer has been, by the kindness of that Society, permitted to consult:—the permission being generously extended to sanction his hope of editing at some time a facsimile of the volume.—It is a copy of the Christian Letter, annotated in many places and at considerable length by Hooker's own hand. His marginal notes are of diverse sorts: at one point, a few words of amusement or indignation: at another, a memorandum of some reference that he must not forget to quote: at another the outline or the *idée mère* of an argument to be worked out fully afterwards. Of course Hooker never thought that the notes would see the light: he jotted them down with entire and unhesitating frankness, just as they occurred to him: he would have arrayed his thoughts and feelings very differently before he suffered them to come abroad. And so Mr. Keble seriously doubted whether it was right to publish them: but happily he decided that it was. "Some of them," he well says, "are intrinsically so valuable; others so curious, as "affording specimens of the way in which important discussions "begin as it were to germinate in such a mind as that which "planned and executed the Books of the Laws of Ecclesiastical

tax Hooker's patience. Cf. his manuscript note jotted down in the margin of p. 36: "What a misery is it to "be troubled with an adversary into "whom a man must put both truth "and wit."

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's manuscript note on the passage taunting him with his frequent use of Aristotle and "the ingenuous Schoolmen" (p. 43) may well have been written with the quiet smile that a contemporary marks as characteristic of him. (Cf. Fowler, History of C. C. C., p. 138): "If

"Aristotle and the Schoolmen be "such perilous creatures, you must "needes think yourself an happie "man, whome God hath so fairely "blest from too much knowledg in "them."

<sup>2</sup> In one case, concerning Jewel's language about intention, so flagrantly that Hooker's jotting on the margin of p. 30 begins abruptly with, "You ly, Sir."—Cf. Hooker, V. lviii. 3, note 2 (Keble's Edition), and Editor's Preface, Vol. I, p. xxvii. § 9.

"Polity; a third sort again, such perfect samples (so to speak) of his manner and sentiments, that inserting them seemed on the whole more just to the truth, and to the Author's memory<sup>1</sup>." Accordingly almost all the annotations are to be found in Mr. Keble's edition, either in notes on those passages of Hooker with which through the criticisms of the *Christian Letter* they are connected, or else in the 3rd Appendix to the Editor's Preface.—In pursuance of Mr. Keble's example some have been quoted in this Introduction: and, as has been said, it is hoped that it may ere long be possible for them all to be seen together with the words which stirred Hooker to write them, and which his hand underlined. For it is, of course, only in connexion with those words that the annotations on them can be fully understood or justly appreciated.

(iii) These marginal notes, then, written by Hooker in his copy of the *Christian Letter* show one stage in his preparation for answering that Tract: they express the thoughts and feelings with which he read it, and which doubtless he would have reviewed and challenged and chastened in writing his deliberate reply to it. The important document attached as Appendix I to Book V shows another stage in the same course of preparation. It was first published in 1836 from a MS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin: and Mr. Keble judged that its genuineness is "morally demonstrable." It consists of three fragments, differing somewhat in character and in the clearness of their relevance to the *Christian Letter*.

1. The first deals clearly and expressly with the fifth Article in the *Christian Letter*<sup>2</sup>, and sets forth Hooker's mature conviction with regard to the relation of God's grace to the will and reason of man. The writer of the *Christian Letter* had in the fifth Article assailed two passages in Hooker's First Book: (a) "There is in the Will of man naturally that freedom, whereby it is apt to take or refuse any particular object whatsoever being presented unto it<sup>3</sup>": and (b) "There is not that good which concerneth us, but it hath evidence enough for itself, if Reason were diligent to search it out<sup>4</sup>." The ground of assault against these passages was that they were judged contrary to the teaching

<sup>1</sup> Keble's Hooker, Editor's Preface, pp. xx, xxi. § 7.  
<sup>2</sup> pp. 11, 12. <sup>3</sup> I. vii. 6. <sup>4</sup> I. vii. 7.

of the Church of England that "Without the grace of God (which is by Christ) preventing us, that we will, and working together, while we will, we are nothing at all able to do the works of piety which are pleasing and acceptable to God<sup>1</sup>." Hooker's careful answer is in harmony with the whole tenor of his teaching, and particularly with the line he holds in Book III. As there he argued that it is not contrary to the truth that "nature hath need of grace" to teach that "grace hath use of nature": as there he argued that the things of God "being by grace discovered, are effectual to persuade reasonable minds and none other, that honour, obedience, and credit, belong of right unto God<sup>2</sup>"; so here he insists that, in will and in reason, aptness is one thing, ability is another. "Had we kept our first ableness, grace should not need; and had aptness been also lost, it is not grace that could work in us more than it doth in brute creatures." "The natural freedom of man's will was contained in the purpose of creating man, (for this freedom is a part of man's nature); grace contained under the purpose of predestinating man may *perfect*, and doth, but cannot possibly *destroy* the liberty of man's will<sup>3</sup>." "Man hath still a reasonable understanding, and a will thereby framable to good things, but is not thereunto now able to frame himself. Therefore hath God ordained grace, to countervail this our imbecility": to quicken reason, to overcome its sloth and sluggishness and carelessness, to illuminate and certify it: to give to the will, not the mere aptness to choose or refuse, which is essential to it as will<sup>4</sup>, but "the ability of virtuous operation." And "Saving grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost, which lighteneth inwardly the minds, and inflameth inwardly the hearts of men, working in them that knowledge, approbation, and love of things divine, the fruit whereof is eternal life<sup>5</sup>." By his favourite method of bringing in distinction where things had been confused, Hooker here answers his opponent, who had got wrong by confounding aptness with ability:—"I conclude therefore, the natural aptness of man's will to take or refuse things presented before it, and the evidence which good things have for themselves, if reason

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Article X.

<sup>2</sup> Bk. V. App. i. §§ 1, 2. pp. 538, 539. § 28. pp. 567, 568.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.* § 1. p. 537.

<sup>4</sup> III. viii. 6, 11. Cf. also *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *ibid.* § 12. p. 548.

"were diligent to search it out, may be soundly and safely taught without contradiction to any syllable in that confession of the Church, or in those sentences of Holy Scripture by you alleged, concerning the actual disability of reason and will, through sin, whereas God's especial grace faileth<sup>1</sup>."

2. The second fragment, concerning the number and the nature of Sacraments, shows no express or decisive sign of connexion with the Christian Letter. It is directed against certain erroneous points of Roman teaching: and it may perhaps represent a train of thought worked out by Hooker in view of some criticism (whether in the Christian Letter or elsewhere) on the supposed affinity of his language about the Sacraments to the Roman doctrine. It would be a natural preliminary to meeting such a criticism to consider exactly where and why he repudiated the Roman view: it would help him to draw clearly and sharply the line which his critics accused him of blurring or transgressing: and Roman misrepresentation of Anglican teaching (reported to him, perhaps, by Sandys who, as appears in his *Europæ Speculum*, had thought much on such subjects, or by Cranmer) may have set his mind to work in the same direction. Whenever and for whatever purpose the fragment was written, it would be natural for him to put it with the papers he was collecting for his answer to the Christian Letter: in which his teaching about the Sacraments was arraigned as unsound. It would help him when he came to write his answer: it would remind him, perhaps, of points on which he was anxious to make his meaning more unmistakably plain.

The chief value of the fragment (which seems less clear and orderly in thought than Hooker's work is wont to be) lies in its restatement of his main position in regard to the doctrine of the Sacraments. "Let it therefore suffice us to receive *Sacraments* as sure pledges of God's favour, signs infallible, that the hand of His saving mercy doth thereby reach forth itself towards us, sending the influence of His Spirit into men's hearts, which maketh them like to a rich soil, fertile with all kind of heavenly virtues, purgeth, justifieth, restoreth the very dead unto life, yea, raiseth even from the bottomless pit to place in thrones of everlasting joy." They (the Romanists) "pretend that to

<sup>1</sup> Bk. V. App. i. § 9. p. 545.

"*Sacraments* we ascribe no efficacy, but make them bare signs of instruction or admonition; which is utterly false. For *Sacraments* with us are signs effectual: they are the instruments of God, whereby to bestow grace; howbeit grace not proceeding from the visible sign, but from His invisible power." Elsewhere he writes, "Neither is it, as Bellarmine imagineth, a thing impossible, that we should attribute any justifying grace to *Sacraments*, except we first renounce the doctrine of *justification* by faith only. To the imputation of Christ's death for remission of sins, we teach faith alone necessary: wherein it is not our meaning, to separate thereby faith from any other quality or duty, which God requireth to be matched therewith, but from faith to seclude in justification the fellowship of worth through precedent works as the Apostle St. Paul doth<sup>1</sup>."

3. The third fragment is of deep interest and value. It is directly and expressly connected with the attack made in the Christian Letter: but it may well have been (perhaps it may be said that it looks as though it were) the application to that attack of work which Hooker had done under the pressure of earlier controversies. For the great theme with which it deals—the distinction between the antecedent and the consequent will of God<sup>2</sup>,—had engaged his strenuous thought for many years: and on three occasions it brought down on him the censure of opponents less thorough and courageous than he was in trying to think things out, or, perhaps, more contented in deference to Calvin's authority. In his sermon at St. Paul's Cross, while he was still a Fellow of Corpus, he had expressed his conviction that such a distinction should be made: and his teaching then was called in question, though Aylmer, the Bishop of London, found no fault with it. Again it was called in question when he was Master of the Temple, where he seems to have re-affirmed it<sup>3</sup>; and Travers "both delivered the truth of such points in a general doctrine, without any touch of him in particular, and conferred with him also privately upon such articles<sup>4</sup>." Again Hooker gives deliberate expression to it in the Fifth Book of

<sup>1</sup> Bk. V. App. i. §§ 17, 18, 16. pp. 554, 553.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. quotation from St. John Damascene, in note on p. 573. Cf. also *supra*, pp. 81, 147.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Walton's Life of Hooker, in Hooker, vol. i. p. 60. § 12.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hooker's Works, vol. iii. pp. 558, 9, 576, 7, 592, 3.

his treatise : and a third time it is challenged :—the writer of the Christian Letter denouncing it as unsound, in his tenth Article. And so as Hooker sets about his answer he prepares to unfold and defend his belief on this point with characteristic depth and force. He is moving, of course, among questions which men may have no words or ideas to ask with intelligence or to answer with adequacy : but in such answer as he gives there are thoughts which may at least preclude some false thinking about the mystery which is implicit in the simplest act of faith and, indeed, in the very conception of a religious life.

God has created a world in which are found both necessary and contingent events<sup>1</sup> : of contingent events some being (or seeming) contingent only because they depend on the concurrence of a number of conditions with the natural causes of the events in question, others being contingent also because they depend on the action of free agents : “in regard of the very “perfection which is incident into the nature of those agents, and “implieth as it were a kind of authority and power to take which “part itself listeth in a contradiction, and of two opposite effects, “to give being unto either<sup>2</sup>.” This distinction between necessary and contingent events, in the world which God has created such as to admit them, is not destroyed or effaced either by His infallible prescience or by His almighty will. Not by His prescience :—for it is the very perfection of His prescience that He foresees events not all after one and the same manner, but as in this world, being what it is, they are. He foreknows them all unerringly : but He foreknows them as they are of their own natures when they come to pass : the necessary, as necessary : the contingent, as contingent :—His prescience “doth not take “away casualties, nor make all things in the world subject to “inevitable necessity<sup>3</sup>.” He foreknows them all eternally : and what He foreknows, “the same both wholly in one sum and “every part thereof distinctly lieth at all times alike open in “His sight<sup>4</sup> :” but His eternal prescience does not interfere with the succession of events in time : He eternally and in one view all together sees them as successively occurring. (And again, “the foresight which God hath of all things proveth not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Bk. V. App. i. §§ 20, 28. pp. 557, 567.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. § 22. pp. 559, 560.

<sup>3</sup> § 23. p. 561.

<sup>4</sup> § 23. p. 561.

"His fore-appointment of all things which are foreseen: because He foreseeth as well what might be and is not, as what is or shall be<sup>1</sup>.") And as His prescience does not overwhelm contingency, so neither does His will overwhelm freedom. He has made a world in which there shall still be uncertain issues, though He is omniscient, and in which there shall still be free choice, though He is omnipotent. The words men use about such things must be, of course, symbolic only and provisional and hazardous: glances, as it were, towards a light that no man can approach: but the whole structure and strength of a reasonable and religious life rests on the belief that God's all-ruling will so bears itself among human affairs that men may choose either right or wrong, life or death. And in the belief of this bearing of God's will is involved the distinction between His antecedent and His consequent willing: between what He willeth "simply of His own voluntary inclination" (as the salvation of all men), and what He willeth "by occasion of something precedent, without the which there would be in God no such will<sup>2</sup>:" though both the antecedent and the consequent willing are embraced in His one essential will of holiness and justice. "Both mercy and wrath come from Him: mercy of His own accord, and wrath by occasion offered<sup>3</sup>:" though wrath, because it is joined with harm to a part of His noblest creatures, cometh in that respect from the will of God as it were with "a kind of unwillingness<sup>4</sup>." "The evil of sin is within the compass of God's prescience, but not of His predestination, or fore-ordaining will. The evil of punishment is within the compass of God's fore-appointed and determining will, but by occasion of precedent sin." "For punishment is to the will of God no desired end, but a consequent ensuing sin<sup>5</sup>."

It does not seem necessary, and it would perhaps be hardly possible, to give any concise account of the later part of this third fragment:—the part which is concerned with the origin of evil, and with the relation of predestination and obduration to the will and works of men. What has been already said may be enough to show the main interest of the fragment—its mature expression of Hooker's divergence and alienation from that which

<sup>1</sup> § 24. p. 562.  
<sup>3</sup> p. 565. Cf. also p. 575.

<sup>2</sup> § 26. p. 564. Cf. also pp. 569, 570.  
<sup>4</sup> pp. 565, 564. <sup>5</sup> p. 572.

generally (whether justly or not) is regarded as Calvin's most characteristic teaching<sup>1</sup>. It is no very rare thing even in the present day to meet men whose abandonment of Christianity began in repulsion from Calvinism, in abhorrence from doctrines which were pressed on them in the name of Christ and which their conscience resented as harsh and cruel: doctrines strong with the consistency of a narrow logic, with the support of famous names, with the evidence of great achievements: yet none the less intolerable to those who know that their own instincts of justice and long-suffering and gentleness are, howsoever imperfect, the best things they have: and who believe that in the Most High there must be that which sanctions and infinitely transcends those instincts, and not a flat, hard contradiction of them<sup>2</sup>. It is no wanton disparagement of human nature to say that even crude forms of Calvinism will always find many adherents; for suspense of judgement, and equal regard for truths that seem in conflict, and the confession of ignorance require certain intellectual as well as moral qualities: and a compact, decisive, logical, unhesitating system has much that is attractive and convenient to many minds; while comparatively few may really harden their hearts to match the sternest language of their creed<sup>3</sup>. But Christianity has suffered and suffers still by being thought inseparable from the harshness of Calvinism: and it is a great thing that the noblest student and teacher of the English Church, in an age pervaded and ruled by the influence of Calvin, had the courage and the insight steadily to direct men's minds towards a truer way of thinking on the mystery of Predestination.

(iv) The second document which is printed as an appendix to Book V is a careful and valuable letter written to Hooker by his former pupil and constant friend, George Cranmer, in 1598, the year after the publication of the Book<sup>4</sup>. Cranmer was now thirty-three years of age: he had stayed at Oxford for some while after taking his degree as Master of Arts; he had travelled for three years in France, Germany, and Italy, with his friend Sir Edwin Sandys, a thoughtful and observant traveller; and he

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Keble's note on § 46. pp. 596, 597.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aubrey L. Moore, *History of the Reformation*, pp. 503, 504, 515-517.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. S. Mill, *Autobiography*, p. 41.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Keble's *Hooker*, Vol. I., Editor's Preface, pp. xxviii. § 10.

had seen something of political and diplomatic life. Thus he could look at the controversy, and at the part which Hooker was taking in it, with a breadth of view, a sense of proportion, a freshness and courage of judgement hardly possible for those of whose horizon a large segment was persistently beset by the controversy. He takes occasion by Hooker's work to mark the change of feeling which had already taken place with regard to the Puritan movement: a change from which he draws an encouraging augury. A few years before "the greatest part of the learned" in the land were either eagerly affected, or favourably inclined toward the new Discipline: those who contended against it were uneasy and apprehensive: "Many which impugned the Discipline yet so impugned it, not as not being the better form of government, but as not so convenient for our state." Whitgift alone stood out, prompt and confident, and gained time for others to rally. Now there was a great change to be seen:—a sway of judgement against the Puritans: and Cranmer enumerates the causes which have wrought the change. In the first place, the learned have entered more thoroughly into the matter, and found that the Discipline does not answer to the glowing description which had been given of it. In the second place, and more widely, men have been alienated from it by the course taken by some of its supporters: a course of advancing vehemence, culminating in the Mar-Prelate scurrility<sup>1</sup>, and in Hacket's Conspiracy. Again, men have had time to see not only the excess into which Puritanism could run, but also the advantage that others could draw from the Puritan position. Thus it seems to Cranmer that if the position of the Puritans be true, the main and general conclusion of Brownism cannot be false: and he urges Hooker that above all points "this one should be strongly enforced against them." Then there are those whom he calls "a sort of godless politics": men who took part in religious controversy for mere worldly ends: who were for their own objects forward enough to destroy Episcopal authority, but would be found very backward when it came to erecting Presbyterial. Atheism again, while it draws its chief strength from the predominance in some

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer speaks with just sternness of those who "although they could not for shame approve so

"lewd an action, yet were content to lay hold on it to the advancement of their cause."

men of wit over judgement, and from their sensuality, found itself helped by the unreasonableness of Puritan preaching and the discredit thrown on the Ministry: and this again is a point which Cranmer would like to see pressed home. Nor had the Papists failed to profit by the dissensions of their opponents: especially as the Puritans had rashly insisted that those dissensions reached to matters of faith and salvation.

Thus men had discovered the harm that Puritanism might do either by the intemperance of its advocates or by the use that others would make of it. And this discovery, which was open to plain men, worked with the conviction among learned men that the discipline was not what they had been led to think; and the movement had been losing ground.

But there is a further course of argument on which Cranmer would have Hooker enter and in which he seems to indicate three stages. First, it should be pointed out that the essence of the Puritan contention lies in the overthrow of Episcopal and the erection of Presbyterial authority: and that all else is really subordinate and incidental as compared with this: and that if all the flaws and abuses which are alleged by the Puritans were amended they would be "no whit nearer their main purpose." Secondly, they are culpable in the way they attack these flaws and abuses: for their real purpose is destructive rather than corrective: they are not really working for amendment but for revolution: as is shown by the bitter and reproachful terms they use, by their appealing to the common people (who lack competency of judgement, skill or authority to amend what is amiss), and by the triviality of many of their censures. Thirdly, it is a point on which especial stress should be laid, that if the Church is to be attacked because of the faults of individuals, the Commonwealth lies open to attack on the same ground. In both states, ecclesiastical and civil, "men have always been and will be "always men, sometimes blinded with error, most commonly "perverted by passions": and if their misdoings are to be the ground for recasting the whole system which individuals here and there abuse, no system, in Church or Commonwealth, will be safe.

The letter ends with a fine and serious appeal that the clergy, especially in the Universities, should be urged to give most heed

to what matters most:—with “a right esteem and valuing of  
“each thing in that degree wherein it ought to stand”—“to  
“preach Christ Crucified, the mortification of the flesh, the  
“renewing of the spirit; not those things which in time of  
“strife seem precious, but passions being allayed, are vain and  
“childish<sup>1</sup>.”

<sup>1</sup> Cranmer's letter seems an interesting and characteristic outcome of a mind trained by Hooker's direct and sustained influence. A like illustration of his influence in teaching may be found in the remarkable and

suggestive book, *Speculum Europa*, by Cranmer's fellow-pupil, Edwin Sandys.—Cf. Fowler, *History of Corpus Christi College*, pp. 153, 4, and note.

## CHAPTER VII.

### *The Outcome of Hooker's Work.*

THE service which Hooker rendered to England and to the English Church may be measured in two ways. His work may be regarded in relation to the issues which were involved in the conflicts of his day,<sup>1</sup> or in its permanent bearing on the conception and position of the Church.

(i) What has been already said about the Puritan Movement may go some way towards indicating the importance of the task to which Hooker gave some fifteen years of diligence. He lived in a critical time: and it was no trivial or parenthetic controversy into which he entered. The real question was whether the English Church should be re-fashioned after the pattern of Geneva: and anyone who will study the history of Geneva when such a discipline as the Puritans extolled was in full force there, may see what that question meant for England. On the side of the Puritans, or at least available for their cause, was the great name of Calvin: a name which carried such authority as is now difficult to realize. It must be remembered that Calvin "first gave a scientific existence to Protestant theology on the "Continent"<sup>1</sup>: and that in the strength of "intense faith and unflinching consistency," with the masterfulness of a hard, logical, systematic, determined mind, he had constructed, enforced, maintained a polity which seemed as strong as Rome itself. A system such as his impresses many men as much by its faults as by its advantages: and it may be doubted whether any man has told so forcibly on others' thoughts and feelings as Calvin. His "Institutes" (first published when he was only twenty-six) became a sort "of oracle and text-book for the Students in the Universities"<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Espin, *Critical Essays*, p. 167: the whole Essay on the Life of Calvin being of great interest and value.

<sup>2</sup> Archdeacon Hardwick, *Church History, Reformation*: pp. 240, 241.

Hooker had been trained in reverence for Calvin: all who seem likely to have told upon him most when he was most likely to be affected by the convictions of his elders—John Hooker, Jewel, Cole, Rainolds, Archbishop Sandys, Whitgift—would tend to guide his mind that way: but his private notes on the “Christian Letter” in 1599 show how strongly he resented the unreasonable and servile deference with which many bowed to Calvin’s authority. “Safer,” he writes, “to discuss all the Saints in heaven than M. Calvin.” “His writing but of three lines in disgrace of any man as forcible as any proscription throughout all reformed churches; his rescripts and answers of as great authority as decretal epistles.” “Do we not daily see that men are accused of heresy for holding that which the fathers held, and that they never are clear, if they find not somewhat in Calvin to justify themselves<sup>1</sup>?” Such was the weight of the name which the Puritans invoked, with substantial justice, in support of their platform. And in the same way they could use the reasonable dread and the natural abhorrence of Rome in the minds of most Englishmen at that time. Those into whose personal and appreciative experience there had come the events of Mary’s reign, the plots against Elizabeth, the insolent decree of Pius V in 1570, claiming to release the English people from their allegiance to the Queen, and the massacre of St. Bartholomew, were likely to consider favourably a system which promised to be in England, as it had been at Geneva, a secure, decisive bulwark against the restless aggression of the Papacy, and to feel a commendable thoroughness in the demand that there should be “no communion nor fellowship with Papists, *neither in doctrine, ceremonies, nor government*<sup>2</sup>.” In these two ways there was a welcome ready in men’s hearts for much that the Puritans had to say: the Church’s cause had to be defended in a field that was not clear or fair: while many even among those who were on the Church’s side realized imperfectly the worth of that for which they were called to contend.

On such an issue as that which had to be decided between the historic system of the Church and the Puritan polity many forces tell—the deeper tides of national character, the foresight and

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, vol. i. 133, 134, 139, notes.

<sup>2</sup> Hooker, IV. iii. 1.

patience of statesmanship, the testing and rectifying action of time, the will of those who wield power, the mistakes and exaggerations of assailants, and argument. It was with the last of these forces that Hooker served the English Church. The other forces might have brought about the same result: but if they had effected it, without a preponderant force of argument, the victory would have been unsatisfactory and precarious: a victory such as leaves, on one side, little credit and a demoralizing precedent, and, on the other, deep resentment, with some just sense of tyranny: since it is of the essence of tyranny that it commands in one way what should be earned in another<sup>1</sup>. It may not have been absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the English Church in Elizabeth's reign, but it was profoundly important for its welfare and its good name, that thoughtful men should feel that where students and theologians contended the Church had held its ground. And that Hooker ensured. He gave the Church of England a reply for any such taunt as that, when its cause was weak in argument, it was saved by force. Of all that was written in the voluminous debate, most survives only among the curiosities of controversy, or the materials for historical research; nothing has come near the eminence which Hooker's work securely holds. His treatise alone has stood the trial of time, and taken rank with the abiding works of learning and reflection. There may be much in the mixed record of the English Reformation which those who are jealous for the Church's honour find it humiliating to recall—much about which men may wonder that it was over-ruled for good. But in the field of argument during the Elizabethan period the Church of England need not fear a comparison between the work of its great champion and that of his antagonists.

Yet Hooker's main achievement is independent of the particular controversy in which he had to bear his part, and of the course of events upon which his work directly told.

(ii) Dean Church has said that "Hooker was one of those rare "controversialists who are more intent on shewing *why* their "opponents are wrong than even the fact that they are so<sup>2</sup>." That intentness was fully called out by his debate with and

<sup>1</sup> Pascal, *Pensées*, p. 72 (ed. Michaut, 1896).

<sup>2</sup> R. W. Church, *Introduction to Hooker*, Bk. I. p. xvi.

respect for Travers. It carried him beyond the details over which men were contending, beyond the discussion of this or that ceremony, this or that interpretation of a particular text: it led him to search out and distinguish the fundamental mistake of the Puritan position: and he judged that it consisted in a wrong conception of the relation between revelation and human life. "A number there are," he says, "who think they cannot admire as they ought the power and authority of the word of God, if in things divine they should attribute any force to man's reason<sup>1</sup>":—whereas the truth is that "to teach men Wisdom professeth, and to teach them every good way; but not every good way by one way of teaching": and "we may not so in any one special kind admire her, that we disgrace her in any other<sup>2</sup>." The Puritan disparagement of human authority and of reason was at once a dishonouring of God in certain great fields or branches or manifestations of His work, and also a misrepresentation of the way in which His word deals with men. For it ignored or slighted those wide and various and patient processes by which everywhere and always He is teaching men—the processes of nature and of history, the processes of all rational and social life, and of all that is now summed up as civilization—processes which are as truly His as those clearer and more express disclosures of His mind and will which He has been pleased to make through revelation, in the more special sense of that term. And also this disparagement was untrue as to the manner in which those more express disclosures enter into human life and treat men's faculties. For as in the incarnation so in revelation<sup>3</sup> God lays hold on manhood in its fullness, that in its fullness He may raise it. Scripture comes into human life, not with the abrupt invasion of an alien, heedless force, disregarding and isolating itself from all around it: but with a deep, considerate, penetrating, sympathetic care "that nothing be lost": using all that can possibly be used: hallowing all human powers; not despising or overbearing or discarding them, but presupposing and adopting them; encouraging, educating, illuminating, purifying, liberating, strengthening, uplifting them, even while it transcends them. Thus in divine matters the activity of reason, the exercise of

<sup>1</sup> III. viii. 4.<sup>2</sup> II. i. 4.<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bp. Woodford, *The Great Commission*, pp. 105-109.

judgement, whether individual or corporate, is not superseded by God's revelation: it is taught and blessed and guided.

And in giving to the Church the laws of its polity God has chosen the same course and manner of dealing with men. He has not thrust aside or discredited the natural processes by which He Himself has from the beginning enabled men to recognize and to frame laws. He has instructed and enlightened the Church for the right use of that legislative faculty and authority which naturally belongs to societies of men, and in virtue of which the society may in His Name require the obedience of its members to laws so made. The substance indeed, the primary points of ecclesiastical polity, He has revealed in Scripture; yet there also He has pre-supposed the power and activity of reason for the recognition, apprehension, and application of that which is revealed: while much that is secondary or subsidiary He has left to be determined, adapted, modified by the ability and authority which in the universal system of His providence He has given to and sustained in the Church as a spiritual society. In this as in all else He has not despised but has used the order which His all-encompassing and all-pervading Wisdom has from the first given to the world.

Thus Hooker's appeal in things spiritual is to a threefold fount of guidance and authority—to reason, Scripture, and tradition—all alike of God, alike emanating from Him, the one original Source of all light and power—each in certain matters bearing a special and prerogative sanction from Him, all in certain matters blending and co-operating. And in maintaining the rightfulness and the duty of thus appealing, Hooker rendered his highest service and did his most abiding work. For on equal loyalty to the unconflicting rights of reason, of Scripture, and of tradition rest the distinctive strength and hope of the English Church<sup>1</sup>. It has left much undone which it ought to have done: it has much to do to "perfect that which is lacking": but it has not set up any barrier that stays it from a sincere, unflinching reference of its case to that threefold authority. And so it may hope to commend itself to the conscience of reasonable and religious men, and to hold its continuous course; strengthened, not imperilled by the progress of human life and thought, by the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, ch. i., esp. p. 6 (ed. 1892).

increase of learning, by the gain of frankness in enquiry; blending the wisdom and strength of a great past with the recognition of what is greatest in the present: ancient, and not antiquated. So also it may hope to go on proving itself able and worthy to be the Church of a great and free nation: and, by "its adaptation to human nature and society, the reasonableness of its customs, the largeness of aim and the freedom and elevation of spirit in its principles and working," fit to express and represent the religious life of the English people<sup>1</sup>. And so, lastly, it may cherish a yet higher hope. It would be presumptuous to say either that the fulfilment of "the Divine purpose of visible unity amongst Christians<sup>2</sup>" is near at hand, or that it is far off. But the thought of that fulfilment has come to occupy a larger space than used to be given to it in the religious view of the world: and it seems at least as though many causes were at work to prepare that atmosphere in which the idea of unity may live and move and work<sup>3</sup>. At such a time some fresh light falls on the worth of all that may be required for the service, the developement, the realization, in due season, of that idea. The hope of being allowed, through faith and toil and patience, to bear a special part in forwarding, when and as God wills, His purpose of unity, is a serious and chastening hope to entertain: but it cannot be declined when the call to entertain it comes to the Church of England from a sober study of its own history, and heritage, and conditions. And in all that has led men to think that the Church of England may be found to have a special power to attract and draw towards union the sundered communities of Christendom<sup>4</sup>, nothing can be reckoned higher than its unreserved appeal to reason, to Scripture, and to tradition. The maintenance of that appeal secures the only ground of common principles on which a general and real agreement is likely to be attained: while the Church that maintains it has the best hope of advance in the character and temper which may make for reconciliation.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. W. Church, Introduction to Hooker, Bk. I. p. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Lambeth Conference, 1897: Resolutions, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lambeth Conference, 1897: Reports, p. 110. "The day is passed in which men could speak of the

"Church of God as if it were an aggregate of trading establishments, as if our divisions promoted a generous rivalry, and saved us from apathy and indolence."

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Lambeth Conference, 1897: Reports, p. 108.

Thus that larger view of God's dealing with human life and with the Church which Hooker set forth and defended against the Puritan disparagement of human reason and authority, may be regarded as essential to the threefold hope of the English Church : its hope of abiding unshaken and enriched by the progress of the world ; its hope of rising towards the fulfilment of its work for England ; its hope of guarding for Christendom through the time of its severance the ground on which at last its reunion may rest. In the long and manifold history which lies behind such hopes the part of any one man can be but very small. But Hooker lived in an age of great demands and opportunities : he realized their greatness, and he had rare gifts for meeting them : from early boyhood he worked hard, and no sort of self-regarding marred the simplicity of purpose in his work. He withstood not only the vulgar trials of publicity and controversy, but also the less palpable temptation to buy effect at the cost of breadth and thoroughness : to force facts, if it be but a little, instead of always facing them. And so three centuries have tried his work and proved it real. There may be blemishes upon it here and there, —pleas in defence of things that could not be defended, a hesitating or imperfect apprehension of some points,—hindering traits taken from the peculiar difficulties of his day. But the substance of the work is sound and great : and it seems true to say that the Church of England need not be ashamed to reckon Hooker not only with the foremost of those who have upheld its cause and delineated its position, but also as one of those who have most justly shown among men its distinctive mind and character.

## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX I.

It may be worth while to cite here a few passages from certain books which appeared and attracted much notice towards the close of Mary's reign : and which, by the temper they evinced and the principles they affirmed, were likely to be taken into account when under Elizabeth religious controversy was rising high, and some of those who wrote thus were bearing part in it.

(I) "*The First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstruous Regiment of Women.*" Published anonymously in 1558, but acknowledged by John Knox in the same year as his.

"To promote a Woman to bear rule, superiority, dominion, or empire above any realm, nation, or city, is repugnant to Nature ; contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to His revealed will and approved ordinance ; and finally, it is the subversion of good order, of all equity and justice." (The Works of John Knox, Wodrow Society, vol. iv, p. 373.)

"Nature doth paint them forth to be weak, frail, impatient, feeble, and foolish ; and experience hath declared them to be unconstant, variable, cruel, and lacking the spirit of counsel and regiment." (p. 374.)

"Let men that receive of women authority, honour, or office, be most assuredly persuaded, that in so maintaining that usurped power, they declare themselves enemies to God." (p. 415.)

"The same is the duty as well of the Estates as of the People that hath been blinded. First, they ought to remove from honour and authority that monster in nature : so call I a woman clad in the habit of man, yea, a woman against nature reigning above man. Secondly, If any presume to defend that impiety, they ought not to fear first to pronounce, and then after to execute against them the sentence of

"death. If any man be afraid to violate the oath of obedience which they have made to such monsters, let them be most assuredly persuaded, that as the beginning of their oaths, proceeding from ignorance, was sin, so is the obstinate purpose to keep the same nothing but plain rebellion against God." (p. 416.)

"I fear not to say, that the day of vengeance which shall apprehend that horrible monster Jezebel of England, and such as maintain her monstrous cruelty, is already appointed in the counsel of the Eternal." (p. 420.)

(II) *The Appellation of John Knox from the cruel and most unjust sentence pronounced against him by the false bishops and clergy of Scotland, with his supplication and exhortation to the nobility, estates, and commonalty of the same realm.* (Geneva, 1558, printed in Knox's Works, Wodrow Society, iv. 467 seq.) :—

"The punishment of such crimes as are idolatry, blasphemy, and others, that touch the majesty of God, doth not appertain to kings and chief rulers only, but also to the whole body of that people, and to every member of the same according to the vocation of every man, and according to that possibility and occasion, which God doth minister to revenge the injury done against his glory, what time that impiety is manifestly known." (p. 30.)

With regard to the utter destruction of a city declining to idolatry, and the slaughter of all in such a city, including infants and children and simple people :—

"In such cases will God that all creatures stoop, cover their faces, and desist from reasoning, when commandment is given to execute His judgement." (p. 32.)

"If the contempt or transgression of Moses' law was worthy of death, what should we judge the contempt of Christ's ordinance to be? (I mean after they be once received)." (p. 34.)

"I say, if any go about to erect and set up idolatry or to teach defection from God, after that the verity hath been received and approved, that then not only the Magistrates, to whom the sword is committed, but also the people are bound by that oath, which they have made to God, to revenge to the uttermost of their power the injury done against his Majesty." (p. 35.)

"I fear not to affirm, that it had been the duty of the nobility, judges, rulers, and people of England, not only to have resisted and againstanded Mary that Jezebel, whom they call their queen, but also to have punished her to the death with all the sort of her idolatrous priests, together with all such, as should have assisted her,

"what time that she and they openly began to suppress Christ's  
"Evangel, to shed the blood of the saints of God, and to erect that  
"most devilish idolatry, the papistical abominations." (p. 36.)

(III) Antony Gilby's *Admonition to England and Scotland* was published in the same volume with Knox's Appellation<sup>1</sup>: it begins with a laudatory reference to the "many profitable admonitions to you  
"twain (O England and Scotland)": and the volume closes with a brief note from John Knox to the reader, containing the four propositions which he intended to maintain in the Second Blast of the Trumpet, deferred for the appearance of a promised answer to the First Blast:—they are as follows:—

"1. It is not birth only nor propinquity of blood that maketh a king  
"lawfully to reign above a people professing Christ Jesus, and His  
"eternal verity, but in his election must the ordinance, which God  
"hath established, in the election of inferior judges be observed.

"2. No manifest idolater nor notorious transgressor of God's holy  
"precepts ought to be promoted to any public regiment, honour or  
"dignity in any realm, province, or city, that hath subjected the self to  
"Christ Jesus and to his blessed Evangel.

"3. Neither can oath nor promise bind any such people to obey and  
"maintain tyrants against God and against His truth known.

"4. But if either rashly they have promoted any manifest wicked  
"person, or yet ignorantly have chosen such a one, as after declareth  
"himself unworthy of regiment above the people of God (and such be  
"all idolaters and cruel persecutors), most justly may the same men  
"depose and punish him, that unadvisedly before they did nominate,  
"appoint and elect." (pp. 77, 78.)

(IV) *Knox's letter to Elizabeth*: July 20th, 1559:—

"It appertaineth to you, therefore, to ground the justness of your  
"Authority, not upon that law which from year to year doth change,  
"but upon the eternal providence of Him, who, contrary to nature,  
"and without your deserving, hath thus exalted your head. If thus in  
"God's presence ye humble yourself, as in my heart I glorify God for  
"that rest granted to His afflicted flock within England, under you,  
"a weak instrument, so will I with tongue and pen justify your  
"Authority and Regiment, as the Holy Ghost hath justified the same  
"in Deborah, that blessed mother in Israel. But if, these premisses (as  
"God forbid) neglected, ye shall begin to brag of your birth, and to  
"build your authority upon your own law, flatter you who so list, your

<sup>1</sup> pp. 59-77. It is printed in Knox's Works, Wodrow Society, vol. iv. pp. 553 seq.

"felicity shall be short." The Works of John Knox : Wodrow Society, vol. vi. p. 50. Cf. pp. 18, 19 (Knox to Cecil).

(V) *How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their subjects : and wherein they may lawfully by God's Word be disobeyed and resisted : wherein also is declared the cause of all this present misery in England, and the only way to remedy the same :* by Christopher Goodman.—Geneva, 1558.

The Preface, by William Whittingham, tells how this treatise was expanded by Goodman from a Sermon he had preached on the text "Judge whether it be just before God to obey you rather than God" : and towards the close has the following passage : "Beware therefore that thou neglect not him that bringeth the word of God, but quickly give ear and obey. For if thou desirest to know thy duty to thy Prince, and his charge likewise over thee, read this book and thou shalt well understand both : if thou wish for Christian liberty, come and see how it may easily be had : if thou wouldest love God above man, here thou shalt know how to obey God rather than man." . . . "Obedience is necessary where God is glorified, but if God be dishonoured thy obedience is abominable in the sight of God, be it never so beautiful in man's eyes." (pp. 7, 8.)

In the treatise itself, Goodman speaks of "that monster in nature, and disorder amongst men, which is the Empire and government of a woman" : the divine ordinance being "from the middle of thy brethren shalt thou choose thee a King, and not amongst thy sisters." (p. 52.)

"That wicked woman, whom you untruly make your Queen, hath (say ye) so commanded. O vain and miserable men, to what vileness are you brought, and yet as men blind, see not ? Because you would not have God to reign over you, and His word to be a light unto your footsteps, behold, He hath not given an hypocrite only to reign over you (as He promised) but an idolatress also : not a man according to His appointment, but a woman, which His Law forbiddeth, and nature abhorreth : whose reign was never counted lawful by the word of God : . . . a woman begotten in adultery, a bastard by birth, contrary to the word of God and your own laws." . . . "In obeying her, ye have disobeyed God. Then in disobeying her, ye shall please God." (pp. 96, 97, 103.)

After referring to the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy (as Knox had done, as Cartwright afterwards did), Goodman goes on—"though it appear at the first sight a great disorder, that the people should take upon them the punishment of transgression, yet, when the Magistrates

"and other officers cease to do their duty, they are, as it were, without officers, yea, worse than if they had none at all, and then God giveth the sword into the people's hand." (p. 185.)

"It is not only praiseworthy in all, but required of all, . . . to see the judgements" of God's Laws "executed upon all manner of persons without exception." . . . "If it be not done by the consent and aid of the Superiors, it is lawful for the people, yea it is their duty to do it themselves, as well upon their own rulers and Magistrates, as upon other of their brethren, having the word of God for their warrant." . . . "If death be deserved, death: if other punishments, to see they be executed in all."

"For this cause have you promised obedience to your Superiors, that they might herein help you: and for the same intent have they taken it upon them. If they will so do, and keep promise with you according to their office, then do you owe unto them all humble obedience: if not, you are discharged, and no obedience belongeth to them: because they are not obedient to God." (pp. 189, 190.)

These passages are cited here not as representative of the opinions of any considerable section of the Puritans, but as pointing to an element in the struggle which could not fail to tell on the policy of any Government that had to bear part in it. Mr. Carlyle, after speaking of Puritanism as, in some senses, "the only phasis of Protestantism that ever got to the rank of being a Faith," goes on to speak of Knox as its "Chief-Priest and Founder<sup>1</sup>." Professor Lorimer says that "Knox was for several years unquestionably the most conspicuous and influential man among the English Puritans. More than any other single man, looking to all that he did for the cause, both in England and on the Continent, he deserves to be regarded as the Father and Founder of English as well as Scottish Puritanism<sup>2</sup>."—Goodman, Whittingham, and Gilby were all prominent and considerable men in the Puritan party. It was not unnatural that in a perilous and unsettled time the association of their names with language such as has been quoted here should be remembered against them and against their cause<sup>3</sup>. There were many who were ready to take up without qualification or reserve or refinement the broad principle which they had rashly thrown into the general confusion: there were many who were willing confidently to say how God should be obeyed, and to denounce as dishonouring Him all that

<sup>1</sup> Lectures on Heroes, p. 292, ed. England, p. 224.

1870.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Strype's Life of Whitgift, Bk. III. App. No. xxxi. ad fin.

<sup>3</sup> John Knox and the Church of

was alien to their own position : the charge of idolatry came very readily to Puritan lips : and there were always some who would find a minor premise for Knox and Goodman's major, and who would not shrink from the conclusion. So in 1559 the Queen-Regent was suspended "from authoritie within Scotland," "for the preservatioun of the "Commoun-wealth, and for that her synnes appeared incurable." It was an illustration of the same method of inference that came from another quarter when Pius V, in 1570, announced that Elizabeth's subjects were released from their allegiance : and the way the principle might work on rather crazy wits was shown when Arthington and Hacket proclaimed that Elizabeth was not Queen of England, that she had forfeited her Crown, and was worthy to be deprived<sup>1</sup>. These instances of the principle in practical application, together with the plots against the Queen's Government and life, brought out the extreme rashness of encouraging men to any proneness to think that they were God's agents in resisting constituted authority.

## APPENDIX II.

A comparison of D'Ewes' Journal with the Official Journals of the Houses of Parliament makes it apparent that in the Parliaments of 1566 and 1571,—besides a good deal of business over other matters concerning the Church, and besides Mr. Strickland's attempt on April 6th, 1571, to bring before the Commons the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*,—three important Bills were introduced, and fared as follows :—

(i.) That which is known in the Journals as the Bill A, "the Bill, "with a little Book printed 1562, for the sound Christian Religion," called also "the Bill for the Articles of Religion," and, in the Journals of the Lords, (Dec. 14, 1566), "An Act for Uniformity of Doctrine."—It was read in the Commons on Dec. 5, 10, and 13, 1566 : sent to the Lords on Dec. 14, and in the Lords read for the first time on that day.—In the following Parliament, in the House of Commons, on April 7, 1571, it was read and delivered to the Commissioners : on April 6 and 10, the two Houses appointed Committees "to confer about the Book for Doctrine" : on April 19, in the Lords, "Lecta est

<sup>1</sup> Conspiracy for pretended Reformation, pp. 104, 116. Cf. *infra*, App. VI.

"Billa, for the Confirmation of certain Articles touching Matters in Religion." On April 26, in the Commons, "the Bill for Conservation of Order and Uniformity in the Church" was twice read: it had its third reading on the 27th: and on the 28th it was introduced into the Lords from the Commons, as a Bill "for the Conservation of Order and Uniformity in Religion." It was read in the Lords on the 30th. On May 1 its parliamentary career is closed by the Queen's intervention: a message comes from the Lords desiring that a convenient number of the House of Commons be sent presently unto their Lordships, for answer touching Articles for Religion.—Certain Members are sent, and bring back the message that the Queen will publish the Articles "and have them executed by the Bishops, by direction of her Highness' Royal Authority of Supremacy of the Church of England, and not to have the same dealt in by Parliament."—Such was the end and issue of the Bill A: if, as seems most probable, its identity was maintained through the various titles found in D'Ewes and in the Journals.

(ii.) "The Bill for Reformation of the Book of Common Prayer." This was "preferred by Mr. Strickland," on April 14, 1571, and was read the first time, it being then agreed that the Queen's leave should be asked before any further advance was made. The Bill probably embodied the chief points of the Puritan agitation: but it made no progress. Mr. Strickland was summoned before the Privy Council: when the House re-assembled on April 20, after the Easter recess, there was a debate about its Liberties which is very briefly summarized in the official Journals: Mr. Strickland re-appeared the next day: but there is no further mention of the Bill, or of any proposal for Reformation of the Prayer Book in that Parliament.

(iii.) "The Bill B," otherwise called "the Bill for the Order of Ministers," or "the Bill for the Ministers of the Church to be of Sound Religion"; finally passed as an Act to reform certain Disorders touching the Ministers of the Church (13 Eliz. c. 12). This was first introduced in the Commons on Friday, Dec. 6, 1566: read, and appointed to remain in the House, but "this not to stand for any Reading," on April 7, 1571: formally read the first time on April 10: the second time on the 28th: the third on the 30th: read the fourth time and sent to the Lords on May 3: read in the House of Lords the first time on May 7, the second time on the 10th, the third time on the 21st, being then sent down to the Commons with certain Amendments, and returned by them on May 23. At the close of the Parliament on May 29, it stands first among the Acts passed: and its great importance may warrant the main part of its first clause being

cited here. "That the Churches of the Queen's Majesty's dominion "may be served with pastors of sound religion, be it enacted by the "authority of this present Parliament, that every person under the "degree of a Bishop, which does or shall pretend to be a priest or "minister of God's holy word and sacraments, by reason of any other "form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth "by Parliament in the time of the late King of most worthy memory, "King Edward VI, or now used in the reign of our most gracious "sovereign lady, before the feast of the Nativity of Christ next following, "shall in the presence of the bishop or guardian of the spiritualities of "some one diocese where he has or shall have ecclesiastical living, "declare his assent, and subscribe to all the articles of religion, which "only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the "doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a book imprinted, intituled : "Articles, whereupon it was agreed, &c. . . ." The other clauses of the Act contain further provisions for the maintenance and imposition of the Articles, including the requirement of a declaration of assent to the said Articles on Ordination, and on admission to any benefice with Cure<sup>1</sup>.

### APPENDIX III.

#### *Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra.*

The reasons which seem to give special importance to this document, and to warrant its being printed here at full length, have been given above. It is only necessary to say that it is taken from the MS. in the Library of Lambeth Palace, by the permission of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury; and that it is printed *verbatim*.

#### CAP. I.—DISCIPLINA ECCLESIAE SACRA, DEI VERBO DESCRIPTA.

Disciplina Ecclesiæ Christianæ in omne tempus necessaria, à Christo tradita est, et sacris scripturis consignatur. Itaque vera et legitima ex eis iisque solis petenda est. Quæ vero alio fundamento nititur, illegitima et adulterina haberi debet.

Singularum ecclesiarum idem ius, eademque ratio atque descriptio est :

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Journals of the House of Lords: Journals of the House of Commons: D'Ewes' Journals: Hard-

wick, History of the Articles of Religion, pp. 147-150, 226-229.

ideoque nulla sibi potestatem in alias, ac ne Ius quidem ullum, quod non aliis æquè conveniat, vindicare potest.

Singularum ecclesiarum λειτουργοὺς (id est publicorum in eis munerum administros) ecclesiasticâ legitimâ vocatione, qualis infra subiungitur, vocari, et ad munera sua adhiberi oportet. Hi omnes pro diversâ generum suorum ratione, potestate inter se sunt æquales.

Legitimè nemo ad publicum in ulla ecclesiâ munus adhiberi potest, nisi qui ei defungendo idoneus sit. Idoneus verò nemo censendus est, nisi omnium piorum communibus donis, fide nimirum et vitâ inculpatâ ornetur; atque prætereà iis, quæ propria sunt eius administrationis, ad quam adhibendus sit; ad eamque defungendam necessariis. Undè ad eorum donorum explorationem viâ quadam ad ea probanda idoneâ, et examinatione utendum est.

Vocatus, primùm eligi; tum ad id munus, ad quod delectus est, publicis eius ecclesiæ precibus, ad cuius procuracionem adhibetur, ordinari debet: explicatis ante mutuis ipsius, et ecclesiæ officiis.

Administri ecclesiarum sunt primùm verbi Ministri; in quorum examinatione specialiter cavendum, ut sint διδακτικοὶ et δόκιμοι, non νεόφυτοι. Illi vero sunt Pastores, qui doctrinam et sacramenta administrant: vel Doctores, qui versantur in sanâ doctrinâ docendâ et convincendis erroribus. Prætereà verò, sunt etiam Presbyteri, qui singulorum vitæ et moribus invigilent: Atque Diaconi, qui pauperum curam agant.

Presbyterium in singulis ecclesiis constituendum est; quod est, Concessus<sup>1</sup> (*sic*) et quasi Senatus Presbyterorum.

Presbyteri autem nomine continentur, qui in Ecclesiis doctrinam administrant, et qui propriè vocantur Presbyteri.

Presbyterii communi consilio quæcunque ad ecclesiæ suæ statum attinent, diriguntur: tùm, quæ ad totius ecclesiæ administrationem, sive in sacro et communi omnium conventu in nomine Domini congregato, ut omnia in eo fiant ritè, ordine, et ad ædificationem; sive quæ ad omnes eius ecclesiæ cives; nimirum, quæ ad quoscumque bonos ornandos omnibus ecclesiæ privilegiis, quæ eis conveniunt, et malos ecclesiasticis censuris corrigendos pro ratione delicti, private et publice monendo et movendo, a cænâ suspendendo (ut vulgo dicitur) vel ab ecclesiâ excommunicando: aut ad eiusdem administros, eorumque vocationem vel incipiendam vel finiendam sublevando vel puniendo, ad tempus suspensione, vel penitus abdicatione.

Presbyterio dirigendo præest Pastor vel Pastores vicissim, si plures in eadem ecclesiâ sunt.

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., Consensus.

In omnibus autem maioribus ecclesiæ negotiis, ut quibuscunque excommunicandis et administris ecclesiæ eligendis vel abdicandis, nihil insciâ vel invitâ ecclesiâ decerni debet.

Singulares ecclesias mutua auxilia sibi invicem præbere decet; unde Communio quædam inter eas colenda est. Eius autem Communionis finis est; ut singulæ tum quæ ad doctrinæ rationem, tum etiam disciplinæ, ita administrantur, ut ex verbo Dei oportet.

Itaque quæ ad hanc curam attinent, communi eorum, quorum conventus habetur, sententiâ verbo Dei innixâ decernuntur: et quid corrigendum, promovendum, curandumque sit in ulla earum singulari ecclesiâ; vel in omnibus, quæ ad eum (qui habetur) conventum pertinent.

In quo etsi nulla singularis ecclesia ius et potestatem habet in aliam: tamen plurium sententiæ verbo Dei consentaneæ singulares omnes eius Consilii et conventus ecclesiæ parere debent.

Ex Presbyteris deligendi sunt ad hos conventus habendos primarii viri à singulis ecclesiis quorum conventus habetur; et certis mandatis instruendi, cum ad conventum mittantur: et curandum, ut quæ à Conventibus piè decreta retulerint, à Civibus suis earum ecclesiarum studiosè observentur.

Præses, qui conventum moderetur et dirigat, deligendus est ex sententiâ eorum, qui conveniunt. Officium eius est curare, ut conventus piè, quietè, et decorè habeatur: Itaque ad eum pertinet, ut communicationem precibus incipiat et concludat; Singulorum mandata cognoscat; tractanda, ordine proponat; sententias roget et colligat; atque quæ maioris et melioris partis sententia sit, pronunciet. Convenientium verò cæterorum est, sententiam de iis, quæ proponuntur, piè et quietè dicere.

---

Disciplina Synodica ex ecclesiarum (quæ eam ex Dei verbo instauration) usu, Synodis, atque Libris de eâdem scriptis, collecta; et ad certa quædam capita relata.

---

## CAP. II.—DE VOCATIONIS NECESSITATE.

Nemo se in Ecclesiam ingerat ad ullam partem publici muneris exercendi in administratione verbi, sacramentorum, disciplinæ, vel curæ pauperum: Neque verò ullum ecclesiæ munus ambiat vel petat; sed expectet quisque, donec legitime vocetur.

---

CAP. III.—VOCATIONIS INEUNDÆ ET DEFINIENDÆ RATIO, CONTRA MINISTERIUM INDEFINITUM ET DESERTO [sic]<sup>1</sup> ECCLESIAE.

Nemo nisi ad certum aliquod munus à Deo institutum, idque in certâ et singulari ecclesiâ exercendum vocetur. Et qui sic vocatur, ad eam ecclesiam ita obstrictus sit, ut postea absque eius consensu alterius esse, vel ab eâ discedere non possit.

Neque verò quisquam vocetur, nisi qui confessioni doctrinæ et disciplinæ subscripserit; quarum admoneantur exempla apud se habere.

CAP. IV.—DE MINISTRORUM EXAMINATIONE.

In examinatione Ministrorum quærendum est testimonium loci, undè sit; ex quo intelligi possit, quâ vitâ et quibus moribus fuerit; et an addictus alicui heresi, vel hereticorum librorum lectioni; aut curiosis et exoticis quæstionibus, et contemplationibus otiosis: an verò orthodoxus habeatur, et planè per omnia consentiat receptæ in Ecclesiis doctrinæ. Quod si consentiat, curandum ut obsignet confessionem Doctrinæ ecclesiæ et Disciplinæ; et, ut explicet aliquam partem sacræ scripturæ bis vel sæpius, quoties examinantibus videbitur; idque coram Classe, et Ecclesiâ, cuius interest: atque ut interrogetur de præcipuis capitibus theologiæ: atque nùm Ministerio diligenter defuncturus sit; et in eo gerendo sibi, non suas cupiditates et commoda, sed Dei gloriam et ecclesiæ ædificationem quærere, propositum sit. *Denique utrum futurus sit studiosus conservandæ sanæ doctrinæ et ecclesiasticæ disciplinæ.*

Ministri examinentur non solum ab uno Presbyterio, sed etiam ab aliquo maiore conventu.

CAP. V.—DE ELECTIONE.

Ante electionem Ministri, dies indicatur Ieiunii.

Nemo vocetur ad ministerium indefinitum, liberum, et vagum: sed qui vocatur, certæ ecclesiæ destinetur, in quâ munus suum administret.

CAP. VI.—DE EXERCENDÂ ET DEFINIENDÂ VOCATIONIS SUÆ RATIONE.

In aliâ ecclesiâ, quam ea, cuius est; etsi concionari aliquandò iustâ occasione licet: tamen nemo Ministerium ordinarium exerceat, nisi ad

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., desertores

certum tempus, gravi de caussâ, et ex consensu ecclesiæ et Classis suæ. A suâ autem ad aliam migrare non licet, nisi ex eiusdem et Classis consensu; et quidem ita, ut antè ei Ecclesiæ de idoneo Ministro prospectum sit.

---

CAP. VII.—DE OFFICIO MINISTRORUM VERBI, ET PRIMO DE  
RATIONE LITURGÆ.

Minister concionaturus, psalmum vel psalmi partem (incipiendo à primo, et ita ordine progrediendo) Ecclesiæ canendum indicet (annotato fine canendi; ad Dei gloriam nimirum, et ædificationem ecclesiæ). Post psalmum subiungatur brevis admonitio ad ecclesiam de se comparandâ ad ritè precandum Deum. Sequatur precatio continens confessionem generalem reatus peccati originalis et actualis: et pœnæ ob utrumque ex lege debitæ: et promissionem Evangelii, atque ex eâ deprecationem pœnæ et petitionem promissæ gratiæ cum ad totius vitæ officia, tùm præsertim ad verbum piè explicandum et percipiendum. Concludatur hæc precatio oratione Dominicâ. Post concionem subiungantur preces, quæ fiant primum pro gratiâ, quâ auditores proficere possint ex doctrinâ traditâ (præcipuis eius capitibus annotatis): tùm pro universâ ecclesiâ et singulis ordinibus: quæ similiter in Orationem Dominicam desinat. Tum psalmi cantio, ut prius. Postremò concludatur formulâ aliquâ benedicendæ ecclesiæ accommodatâ, e Scripturis petitâ. Qualis est Numeror. vi. 24. 2 Cor. xiii. 13.

---

CAP. VIII.—DE CONCIONIBUS AD ECCLESIAM HABENDIS.

Qui concionem habet ad ecclesiam, aliquam sacræ et Canonicae Scripturæ partem (non autem Apocryphæ) sibi explicandam proponat. Neque verò in ordinario ministerio Postillas (quæ dicuntur) sed Librum aliquem, præsertim novi testamenti, ordine explicet: qui deligatur, habita ratione ministri, et ædificationis ecclesiæ.

Ei, qui concionem habet ad ecclesiam, præstanda sunt duo: quorum primum est, ἀδιαφθορία, id est, incorruptio, integritas; eaque, tùm quod ad ipsam doctrinam attinet, ut nimirum sit sancta, orthodoxa, sana, utilis ad ædificationem; non doctrina dæmoniaca, heretica, fermentata, putris, fabulosa, curiosa, contentiosa: tùm quod ad modum tradendi, ut propria eius loci sit, qui tractatur, et quæ vel ipsis verbis disertè con-

tineatur; vel si διάνοια adhibetur, commoda et clara sit; et quæ ex verborum atque orationis proprietate et elegantia, sententiæque connexionem oriatur: non allegorica, aliena, coacta, aut quæ longius petita fuerit.

Quæ verò eiusmodi est, et quidem præcipuè, quæ Ecclesiæ temporibus aptissima fuerit, proponatur; eiusque explicatio, confirmatio, illustratio, et accommodatio: denique omnis tractatio linguâ vulgari fiat: et argumentis testimoniis atque exemplis è sacris scripturis petitis, et ad institutum aptè, atque ex germano et nativo earum sensu, accommodatis.

Secundum est Σεμνότης id est, reverenda gravitas; quæ etiam habenti concionem præstanda est. Ea verò spectatur in sermone, ut πνευματικός, purus, proprius, simplex et ad captum populi accommodatus sit: non quem decet<sup>1</sup> humana sapientia, vel καινοφρονίαν respiciens; neque ita affectatus, ut ad pompam et ad ostentationem comparatus sit, neque ita neglectus et vilis, ut è cauponis et triviis sumptus esse videatur. Spectatur etiam in moderatione cum vocis, in quâ curandum, ut vitatâ μονοτονία, æqualis sit et gradatim ascendens, et intendens se atque etiam remittens: tum gestus, in quo videndum, ut statu corporis erecto, vocem sequatur totius corporis moderatio: vitatâ ridiculâ gesticulatione, nutatione, et vacillatione: atque crebra in diversas partes conversione. Præterea, ut gravis, modestus, et decorus sit; neque nullus, neque nimius, neque scenicus, neque gladiatorius. Hæc concionem apud ecclesiam habenti præstanda sunt. Ad quæ cum opus fuerit exigantur, qui concionem habent, vel ad conciones habendas se exercent et informant.

Diebus Dominicis singulis binæ (si fieri possit) conciones habeantur: et studeant habentes concionem unâ horâ se continere: præcipuè diebus profestis.

In funeribus, desuescendum commode ab habendis concionibus, quod periculum sit, nè superstitionem quorundam foveant, aut vanitati inserviant.

---

#### CAP. IX.—DE CATECHISMO.

Catechismus in singulis ecclesiis doceatur. Formula duplex sit. Una plenior, ex certorum sacræ scripturæ locorum serie, ad summam Religionis tradendam accommodata; de quâ in Synodo nationali statuatur: iuxta quam singulis septimanis caput aliquod sacræ doctrinæ explicetur. Altera eiusdem generis brevior, ad examinandos rudiores antequam ad Cænam Domini admittantur, accommodata.

---

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., docet

## CAP. X.—DE RELIQUIS LITURGÆ OFFICIIS.

Reliqua Liturgiæ tota ratio in Sacramentorum administratione, et ex usu ecclesiæ in Nuptiarum benedictione consistit. Cuius forma commodissima est, quæ ab Ecclesiis usurpatur, quæ disciplinam ex Dei verbo instaurarunt.

## CAP. XI.—DE SACRAMENTIS.

Sacramenta solus verbi minister administret, et præeunte prædicatione verbi; et quidem tantum in publicis ecclesiæ conventibus.

## CAP. XII.—DE BAPTISMO.

Ad baptismum solæ feminæ non offerent baptizandos; sed pater, si commode fieri potest; vel eius nomine, alii.

Suadendum, nè baptizandis imponantur nomina Dei, Christi, officiorum divinorum, ut Angeli, Baptistæ, et similia: Nec quæ paganismum vel<sup>1</sup> papatum respiciant: Sed ea inprimis, quorum præclara exempla in sacrâ scripturâ extant.

## CAP. XIII.—DE CÆNÂ.

Ante Cænam tertio quoque mense utriusque disciplinæ cùm sacræ, tùm synodicæ descriptio in Consistorio legatur. Et ministri, Seniores, atque diaconi, mutuas censuras exerçant: ita tamen, ut *quod ad doctrinam attinet, Ministri à solis ministris censeantur.*

Ad Cænam admittantur tantum ii, qui confessionem doctrinæ ediderunt<sup>2</sup>, *et se disciplinæ subiecerint*: nisi qui litteras testimoniales idoneas aliundè attulerint, vel alio idoneo testimonio se comprobarunt.

Ad Cænam non admittantur pueri ante annū 14<sup>m</sup>. Dominicâ præcedente Cænam fiat in concione mentio de examinatione (ad quam hortatur Apostolus) et pace per fidem. Eodem verò, quo celebratur; de doctrinâ Sacramentorum et præsertim de Cænâ.

Qui antè ad Cænam admissi non fuerint, quum primum se admitti velint, edant nomina sua apud ministros septiduum ante Cænam: ut Presbyteris detur negotium, de eis inquirendi, ut mature (si quid obsit) iis interdicator. Cuiusmodi si nihil sit, tùm post examinationem ex minore

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., aut

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ediderint

formulâ Catechismi, ubi eo opus erit, ad fidei examinationem coram aliquot Senioribus ac ministris idonei admittantur.

Tempus celebrandæ Cænæ octo minimum dies ante significatur<sup>1</sup>, ut paret se Ecclesia et ut Seniores in obeundo et visitando officium faciant.

---

CAP. XIV.—DE IEIUNIO.

Ieiunii dies ex consilio Consistorii à pastore indicetur, ad deprecationem cladis incumbentis vel imminentis, aut ad petitionem singularis alicuius gratiæ.

Conciones in eo habeantur antemeridianæ et postmeridianæ, ut die Dominico: sed ad rem accommodatæ.

---

CAP. XV.—DE DIEBUS FESTIS.

Festi dies sunt commodè abolendi.

---

CAP. XVI.—DE NUPTIIS.

Sponsalia præcedant Nuptias. Sint de præsentis et sine conditione coram testibus idoneis utriusque partis. Sponsalibus (si commodè fieri potest) minister vel Senior intersit qui Deo invocato et admonitis utrisque de officio, cavebit primò de gradibus divino et humano iure prohibitis. Tum interrogabit, àn liberi à vinculo coniugii sint. Quod si profiteantur et peregrini sint; testimonium idoneum requiratur: Item, si ante fuerint coniugati, de morte coniugis. Quod si profiteantur, et peregrini sint, testimonium idoneum exigatur. Postremò, si sub potestate fuerint, àn ii, quorum interest consenserint.

Sponsalia ritè facta, nè utriusque partis consensu dissolvantur. Ea Nuptiæ sequantur intra duos menses; idque vel ubi promulgatæ, vel alibi cum idoneo testimonio.

Ante nuptias fiat promulgatio tribus diebus Dominicis. Sed promulgationem prius desponsati petant à ministro, et duobus saltem Senioribus, cum parentibus vel curatoribus eorum, ut interrogentur de iis, quæ necesse erit: et exigatur ab iis syngrapha pacti de Nuptiis, vel saltem idoneum de sponsalibus testimonium.

Nuptiis quovis die stato, nisi Ieiunii, poterit benedici.

---

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., significetur

## CAP. XVII.—DE SCHOLIS.

In scholis pueri cū aliis literis, tūm præcipuè in Catechismo instruuntur ut memoriter eum recitent, et intelligere possint. Et ita instituti ad Cænam adducantur, postquam à Ministro examinati et probati fuerint.

## CAP. XVIII.—DE STUDIO THEOLOGIÆ, ET EORUM EXERCITIIS.

In singulis ecclesiis curandum (ubi commodè fieri potest) ut piorum divitum liberalitate alantur pauperes studiosi theologiæ, idonei ad theologica exercitia, et inprimis ad explicationem sacræ scripturæ, quâ ad conciones habendas informantur. Ea verò explicatio, quoties commodum erit, habeatur præsentem saltem aliquo ex ministris, cuius præsentia in officio contineantur; eaque omninò formâ (quod ad concionandi rationem attinet) quâ publicæ conciones. Qua finitâ, cæteri studiosi (illo excluso) notent ubi usquam aberratum fuerit ab iis, quæ supra dictum est ei, qui concionem ad ecclesiam habeat, præstanda esse. De quorum sententiâ minister, qui interest et eorum exercitationi præest, iudicet; et dicentem pro suo iudicio admoneat.

## CAP. XIX.—DE PRESBYTERIS SIVE SENIORIBUS.

Presbyteri singulas domos et membra ecclesiæ cognoscant, ut ministros de singulorum statu instruant; et Diaconos de infirmis et pauperibus, ut eos sublevandos curent. *Non sint perpetui*; neque tamen faciliè moveantur.

## CAP. XX.—DE PRESBYTERIIS.

In Consistorio standum maioris partis sententiæ. Tractanda sunt tantum ecclesiastica: Primò, quæ ad communem publici cœtus moderationem in ratione Liturgiæ, Concionum, precum, sacramentorum, nuptiarum, funerum. Tum, quæ propius ad singulorum inspectionem et facta particularia pertinent.

Referri autem in librum curabunt acta, quæ videbuntur: Tūm in alium librum referant nomina communicantium et baptizatorum, cum nominibus etiam parentum et fideiussorum. Item quorum Nuptiis benedicitur; atque morientium; et quibus testimonia præbentur.

## CAP. XXI.—DE CENSURIS.

Ad consistorium nemo deferatur, nisi ante relato<sup>1</sup> nomine, videatur ita faciendum ex Consistorii iudicio. In delictis levioribus et privatis, tenendum præceptum Christi, Mat. 18.

Graviora crimina, quæ sunt et publica, à Consistorio tractanda sunt. Ea verò censenda sunt eiusmodi, primò quæ palam coram omnibus vel quibusvis committuntur, vel consciâ totâ ecclesiâ. Secundò, quæ loco publico, etsi pauci id sciant. Tertiò, quæ pertinaciâ facta sunt eiusmodi. Quarto, quæ ob gravitatem sceleris, civili et gravi pœnâ plectuntur.

Abdicandi iidem, qui excommunicandi. Item, qui inepti sunt ad ministerium ob ignorantiam : vel qui ob morbum incurabilem, aliamve quamcunque eiusmodi causam, ad ministerium obeundum non sunt idonei. Sed ob morbum vel ætatem non idoneis, sine ignominiâ, honore ministerii iis relicto, alius<sup>2</sup> (abdicato liberaliter consulatur)<sup>3</sup> surrogetur.

Cùm de hæretico agitur ad Consistorium delato, statim appellentur duo vel tres ex vicinis ministris, viri pii et docti, et ab eâ suspicione alieni : ex quorum sententiâ moneatur interim, dum Classis de eo poterit cognoscere.

Pertinaces post admonitionem Consistorii, etsi delictum alioqui non ita grande fuerit, suspendantur a Cænâ. Et, si in pertinaciam persistierint<sup>3</sup>, ita progrediendum erit ad eorum excommunicationem.

Ter publicè denunciatur peccatum, et exponetur quæ officia in delinquentem collata fuerint, ut ad resipiscentiam adduceretur. Atque ita cohortatio fiat ad Ecclesiam, ut eum Domino precibus sollicitè commendent cum ieiunio. Primo dominico nomen non edetur personæ. Secundo edetur. Tertio, denunciabitur, Proximo excommunicandum, nisi quis idoneam causam ei sententiæ interdicens afferre possit, atque ita die quarto sententia feratur. Qui gravia et ecclesiæ probrosa, atque magistratus autoritate graviter plectenda crimina commiserit ; etsi verbis testetur resipiscentiam ; tamen ad eam probandam et tollendum scandalum à Cænâ arceatur. Quod quoties et quamdiu faciendum sit, Consistorium pro suâ sapientiâ iudicabit.

Si administri Ecclesiæ aliquid eiusmodi fecerint, abdicentur. Sed si de ministri doctrinâ quæstio sit ; ad Classem referatur.

## CAP. XXII.—DE CONVENTIBUS ECCLESIAE.

Communicatio in ecclesiâ colenda est per communes conventus. In eis tamen<sup>4</sup> ecclesiastica tractanda sunt ; et quidem ea inprimis, quæ ad

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS. (celato nomine)

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. , et ita ut abdicato liberaliter consulatur,

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. perstiterint

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. tantum

eas ecclesias attinent, quarum conventus habentur<sup>1</sup>. Si quid ad alias Ecclesias pertinuerit, nisi rogati de eo non statuent, sed tantum ad suum proximum maiorem conventum referendum decernent.

Tractandorum genera et ordo hic sit. Post præsentium censum, in quo notanda absentium nomina, quos interesse oportet; ut proximo conventu rationem reddant idoneam, vel conventus iudicio censeantur: Primò, proximi superioris eius generis conventus acta legantur, ut si quid ex eis expediendum supersit, expediatur. Tunc agantur, quæ sunt eius, qui habetur, propria. Et primò tradantur mandata ecclesiarum à singulis eo ordine, quo consederint, unà cum fiduciariis ecclesiarum suarum literis. Secundò, censuræ ecclesiarum eius conventus habeantur unde intelligatur, quo modo instituantur atque administrentur: utrum doctrina et disciplina vigeat; àn administri faciant officium; et cætera similia.

Præterea decernent, quæ ad communem omnium eius conventus ecclesiarum rationem, vel ad ullam in iisdem singularem, pertinebunt. Quæ ratio ad inspectionem Ecclesiarum idonea satis esse potest.

Postremò si videbitur, etiam præsentium delegatorum censuræ habeantur. Conventuri suffragiis deligantur earum ecclesiarum atque conventuum, quorum interest. Ex iis tantum deligantur, qui publicum in ecclesiâ munus exercuit [*sic*]<sup>2</sup> Ministerii vel Presbyterii, et qui doctrinæ et disciplinæ subscripserint, et receperint se in omnibus iuxta verbum Dei gesturos esse.

Seniores item alios et Ministros licet, atque etiam ex conventus sententiâ, Diaconos et studiosos theologiæ, præsertim qui sacris scripturis explicandis in conventu se exercent et interesse, et sententiam rogari: et hos quidem, ut eorum iudicium in tractandis ecclesiæ rebus et exploretur et acuatur.

Sed cum suffragio sint tantum, qui ab ecclesiâ delecti fuerint, et mandata consignata attulerint.

Si quid gravius videtur, de quo deliberandum sit; mittatur à proximè superioris conventus Præsides, vel Ministro eius ecclesiæ, in quâ proximè conventus habendus sit; qui ad ministros omnium eius conventus Ecclesiarum opportunè transmittat; ut ante cum suis communicent, et eorum sententiam cognoscant et referant.

In loco conventibus habendis designando, vicinitatis et aliarum opportunitatum ratio habenda est; modo<sup>3</sup> ulla pars præ cæteris se gravari iustè queri possit.

In omni ecclesiastico conventu præsidem esse decet, qui conventui

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., habetur  
<sup>3</sup> Ibid. ne

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. exercent

habendo præsit: eumque semper alium, si commodè fieri potest, et quem hâc formâ eligi oportet.

Proximè superioris conventus eiusdem generis Præses, vel eo absente Minister ecclesiæ, in qua conventus habetur, conceptis ante precibus ad institutum accommodatis, de eo eligendo ad conventum referet.

Itaque Præses delectus precibus conceptis toti actioni et conventui habendo accommodatis, nomina præsentium recenseat, et notari curet. Itemque absentium, qui proximo conventu appellentur, de reddendâ ratione absentiæ. Quæ, nisi fuerit idonea, ex autoritate conventus censeatur. Tùm proximè superioris eius generis conventus acta legi curet, ut, siquid ex eo supersit, expediatur. Post, à singulis ordine ut sedebunt, fiduciaras literas et mandata obsignata postulabit. Quibus eodem ordine propositis, et satis omnium iudicio agitatis, sententias rogabit, suffragia colliget, et quod maioris partis iudicium fuerit, pronuntiabit: idque in acta referenda curabit, ut exempla singularum ecclesiarum delegati transcribi curent: quæ ecclesiis, quarum interest, communicet. Petentibus responsa coram vel per literas, ex conventus iudicio et autoritate dabit. Censuras, si quæ fuerint administrandæ, exercebit. Curabit omnia piè et quietè transigi, cohortando ad æquitatem et moderationem animi, atque se mutuo tolerandi<sup>1</sup>, ubi opus fuerit: et de pertinacibus atque contentiosis ad conventum referendo: Tandem de proximo conventu ad cœtum referet: Et eundem cum cohortatione alacriter progrediendi in officio, et gratiarum actione, benignè dimittet.

Antequam dimittatur, nemo sine veniâ conventus discedat. Conventus pro generum suorum ratione, autoritatem maiorem, si maiores, minorem, si minores, habent. Itaque nisi de facto aperto et omnibus manifesto agatur; a Minore, si quis graviorem ab eo iniuriam passus esse videatur, ad Maiorem provocare licet, usque ad Œcumenicum: modò à minore ad maiorem ordine ascendat: ita tamen ut conventus sententia rata habeatur, donec à conventu Maioris autoritatis secùs iudicatum fuerit.

Conventus sunt { Classes  
                                  vel  
                                  Synodi.

Classes sunt colloquia Presbyterorum paucissimorum vicinarum ecclesiarum: ut exempli caussâ, 12.

Convenient in Classe delecti singularum eius conventus Ecclesiarum; Minister unus, et Senior item unus.

Convenient autem singulis Semestribus.

<sup>1</sup> British Museum MS., tolerandum

Præcipuè incumbent in eius Classis censuram et inspectionem, explorantes per singula capita, àn omnia in eis iuxta sacram doctrinam et disciplinam Evangelii, gerantur; viz. An quæstio de ullâ doctrinæ parte moveatur?

An Ecclesiastica disciplina vigeat?

An Minister in ullâ earum desideretur; ut de idoneo oportuè prospiciant?

An cæteri Ecclesiæ administri et Presbyteri in singulis constituentur?

An cura sit Scholarium et pauperum?

Qua in re Classes consilio egeant ad promovendum apud se Evangelium?

Ante finem, concio ab aliquo Ministrorum, qui convenerint, per vices vel per Suffragia delecto, habeatur. De quo cæteri iudicabunt inter se, non adhibitis Presbyteris: Et monebunt fraternè, si quid videatur; omnia exigentes ad ea, quæ supra exposita sunt, capit., De iis, quæ concionem apud Ecclesiam habenti præstanda sunt.

#### CAP. XXIII.—SYNODI.

Synodus est conventus delectorum à pluribus, quam unius Classis, ecclesiis.

In eis semper legendi sunt articuli de disciplinâ sacrâ et Synodicâ.

In eis quoque ceteris peractis, Censuræ in omnes præsentis exerceantur: Et Cæna ab eis, si commodè fieri potest, in eâ ecclesiâ in qua convenerint, et cum eâ celebretur.

Synodorum genera duo sunt. Primum est particulare, quod provincialem et nationalem comprehendit.

Synodus autem provincialis est conventus delegatorum ab omnibus Classibus eiusdem Provinciæ.

Provincia, Classes 24, contineat.

Convocandi Synodum provincialem hic ordo idoneus esse potest. Demandetur cura ex consensu Synodi certæ ecclesiæ. Locum et tempus eius cogendæ ex sententiâ Classis suæ designet. Ad eam ecclesiam mittantur ab aliis, quæ in ipsis difficiliora ad expediendum visa sunt: et quæ ad ecclesias totius provinciæ pertinent; et quidem diligenter et mature; ut ea possit oportuè Classes provinciæ de Synodi loco et tempore, atque de rebus in ea tractandis admonere; ut qui mittuntur, paratiores accedant, et ex sententiâ classis suæ de eisdem iudicent.

A singulis Classibus mittantur ad Synodum Provinciale[m] bini Ministri, et totidem Seniores.

Convocabitur singulis sex mensibus, aut etiam sæpius, donec disciplina confirmata fuerit.

Ante verò quàm Nationalis habenda sit, tribus mensibus cogantur, ut parent et instruant ea, quæ ad Nationalem pertinebunt.

Provincialium acta mittantur ad Nationalem per ecclesiam, in qua habetur. Eorum item exemplis singuli ministri instruantur, eorumque rationibus.

Nationalis est Synodus delegatorum ab omnibus Synodis provincialibus, quæ eiusdem Reip. imperio continentur.

Convocandi ratio, nisi ipsa volet secus statuere, eadem sit, quæ provincialis, viz. per certam ecclesiam; sed quæ ex sententia provincialis suæ proximè sequentis, locum et tempus eius habendæ constituat.

A singulis provincialibus deligantur tres Ministri, et totidem Seniores.

Tractabuntur omnium totius Nationis et Regni Ecclesiarum communia negotia; doctrinæ, disciplinæ, cerimoniarum; et inferiorum Conventuum causæ non decisæ, et provocationes cæteraque similia.

Ex eiusdem decreto aliquis deligendus erit, qui commentaria singularum ecclesiarum in unum corpus redigat.

Hactenus de conventibus Particularibus.

Sequitur universalis, qui Synodus Œcumenica dicitur.

Est autem Synodus ex singularum nationalium Synodorum delectis congregata.

Acta Synodorum in unum corpus redigenda sunt.

Atque hæc disciplina, cuius titulus inscribitur *Disciplina ecclesiæ Dei* verbo descripta; quantum iudicare licet, ex ipsius sacræ scripturæ purissimis fontibus hausta atque petita est: et disciplinam ecclesiæ necessariam, *ὁσιώδη*, et omnium temporum communem comprehendit.

Synodica verò, quæ subiungitur, quatenus eisdem fundamentis nititur, necessaria item et æterna est; quatenus verò non disertè sacræ scripturæ autoritate confirmatur, sed ad ecclesiæ usum et tempora pro eorum varietate ex eiusdem Scripturæ analogiâ, et communibus præceptis accommodatur; Ecclesiis, quæ eam amplectuntur, utilis censenda est. Sed in eiusmodi, quæ ad essentiam disciplinæ non spectant, pro diversâ ecclesiarum conditione, ex æquè piâ ratione et verbo dei innixâ, mutari potest.

The Discipline is followed by the form of Subscription or Approval, in English, already given at full length on pp. 74, 75 of this volume.

## APPENDIX IV.

*A Booke of the Forme of Common Prayers, administration of the Sacraments, &c., agreeable to Gods Worde, and the use of the reformed Churches.*

An assertion has been made concerning the "Book of Discipline," that "it was no doubt the same book as that referred to in the proceedings of the Parliament of 1584, under the title of 'A Book of the 'Form of Common Prayers, Administration of the Sacraments,' &c., and which was annexed to a Petition in Sixteen Articles, presented to the Commons by the Puritan Ministers, in which they prayed that the said Book 'might be from hence forth authorized, put in use and 'practised, throughout all her Majesty's dominions' <sup>1</sup>."

There is, the present writer believes, no ground for this statement. In 1593, Bancroft speaks of the "Book of Discipline" as "lately come to light <sup>2</sup>," a very strange expression if nine years before it had been presented to the Parliament: and further, he expressly distinguishes it from the book presented in 1584. "In the Parliament (27 of her Majesty: as I remember) the brethren having made another booke, tearmed at that time: *A booke of the forme of Common prayers, &c.*, and containing in it the effect of their whole pretended discipline: the same booke was penned, altogether statute and law-like, and their petition in the behalfe of it was: viz. *May it therefore please your majesty, etc. that it may be enacted, etc. that the booke hereunto annexed, etc. intituled: a booke of the forme of Common prayers, administration of Sacraments, etc. and everything therein contained, may be from hence forth authorized, put in ure, and practised throughout all your majesties dominions* <sup>3</sup>." A "Bill and Book" were offered to the House of Commons on Dec. 14, 1584, and also on Feb. 27, 1585, with the prayer that the book might be read <sup>4</sup>: and D'Ewes, in his Journals, says that

<sup>1</sup> P. L., in the Introduction to the 1872 Reprint of "A Directory of Church Government."—P. L. is, apparently, Dr. Peter Lorimer, Professor of Theology in the English Presbyterian College.

<sup>2</sup> Dangerous Positions, &c., III. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Id. Ibid. III. x. Cf. Henry Foulis, The History of the Wicked

Plots and Conspiracies of our Pretended Saints, pp. 62, 220.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. D'Ewes' Journals of the Parliaments during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, pp. 339, 410. Cf. Neal, i. 518, 9.—In neither case was the book read, in both cases Elizabeth sent for it: on the latter occasion Mr. Vice-Chamberlain, Sir

the Petition and Book in either case was "for the like effect"; while he describes that offered in 1584 as containing "the form of Prayer and Administration of Sacraments with divers rites and Ceremonies to be used in the Church<sup>1</sup>."—There are references to the Book which was so presented, in Hooker V. xxviii. 2, and in Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, App. to Bk. III. No. xxxi<sup>2</sup>. Most of these references can be exactly verified in "A booke of the Forme of Common Prayers," &c., printed at London by Richard Waldegrave, and reprinted in Hall's *Fragmenta Liturgica*, vol. i. pp. 1-81<sup>3</sup>.—But the date of this book is precisely fixed by the full references made to it, as having been framed "about fower years since," in Bancroft's famous "Sermon preached at Paule's Crosse," on Feb. 9, 1588. "What," Bancroft asks, "if they had obtained their purpose, for the allowance of this 'booke'?" He goes on to speak of another book of Common Prayer, &c., as cast abroad the next year, "with the like authoritie and commendation that the other had," though with very many alterations from it: and then says, "Within another yeere a third booke is begotten and brought forth, differing in some points from both the other: and they have been very earnest that this should be allowed of by publike authority<sup>4</sup>."—It seems impossible to doubt, as one reads Bancroft's Sermon, that the Book presented to Parliament with a Bill in 1584 was that which he mentions first, and identical (substantially if not exactly), with that printed, without date, by Richard Waldegrave:—that the book similarly presented in 1586 was the third described by Bancroft<sup>5</sup>.

Christopher Hatton, reported at the end of the same week that "touching the Book and the Petition, her Majesty had for diverse good causes best known to her self thought fit to suppress the same, without any further examination thereof; and yet conceived it very unfit for her Majesty to give any account of her doings." D'Ewes' *Journals*, p. 412. —Strype was of opinion that in 1586 there was *another* petition, addressed to the Queen, "though the author of the Journal of Parliaments is silent of it." But even if he were warranted in such an inference from the manuscript of an Answer, which he gives, there is no evidence that the Book of Discipline had been presented either to her or to the Parliament.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Strype's *Whitgift*, App. to Bk. IV. No. iii. p. 240.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also App. to Bk. IV. No. iii. pp. 236, 240.

<sup>3</sup> This book is an adaptation of, and to a large extent identical with "Calvin's Common Prayer Book: or the Service, Discipline and Form of the Common-Prayers, and Administration of the Sacraments, used in the English Church of Geneva"; cf. *Phoenix*, II. pp. 204 seq.

<sup>4</sup> Bancroft's Sermon, pp. 61-63 (ed. 1588).

<sup>5</sup> *Id. ibid.* p. 64.

<sup>6</sup> Ames (vol. iii. p. 1677) says that it was the Middleburgh edition that was presented (cf. Hall's *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, vol. i): but the references in Hooker and Strype seem more closely met by Waldegrave's edition.

There is indeed a passage in Bancroft's *Survey* which at first sight seems to imply that a plan of Discipline or Church Government was presented to the Parliament together with the "Booke of the Forme of "Common Prayers." Having spoken of the Platform of Discipline contained in the first Admonition (1572), and again in Cartwright's Replies to Whitgift, he writes thus: "About the yeare 1583 where "before the platfourme of Geneva (as it was lefte at large in Cartwright's "Bookes) had beene followed: now there was a particular draught "made for England, with a newe forme of Common Praier therein "prescribed.

"The yeare ensuing 1584, the seven and twentieth of her Majesty, "out starteth this Booke, with great glory at the Parliament time: and "forthwith the present government of the Church, with all the orders, "lawes and ceremonies thereof, was to be cut-off at one blowe, and this "new booke or platforme must needes be established. But it prevailed "not. Shortly after that Parliament, the saide booke and platforme "was found amongst themselves, to have something amisse in it. And "the correcting of it was referred to Traverse. Which worke by him "performed, came out againe about the yeare 1586, when there was "another Parliament in the nine and twentieth of her Majesties raigne. "But it was then (as I suppose) severed from the saide book of Common "praier: and become an entire worke of it selfe. And then also at the "saide Parliament there wanted not diverse solicitors, for the admittance "of it. Afterwardes a new conference was had againe, about this seconde "corrected booke. For still there were some things out of square "in it<sup>1</sup>."

Bancroft seems to speak here with some looseness and uncertainty<sup>2</sup>: and it is reasonable to interpret what is so said by the more distinct witness cited above. That the book presented in 1584 was "A booke "of the forme of Common prayers" he seems clearly to show: that this was not identical with the "Book of Discipline" is certain<sup>3</sup>: that the "Book of "Discipline" was also presented is very unlikely: for (1) there is nowhere mention of *two* books as being presented, (2) the "Book of Discipline" is intrinsically not such a work as would be thus presented, (3) nine years later Bancroft says it had lately come to light, and (4) there are several parts of it which would be meaningless in combination with the Form of Prayer which was presented<sup>4</sup>. The present writer is therefore

<sup>1</sup> Bancroft, *Survey of the Pre-tended Holy Discipline*, p. 66 (ed. 1593).

<sup>2</sup> "Booke or platform": "book "and platform": "about the year":

"as I suppose."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *infra*, note 1, on p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> A further argument to the same effect might perhaps be drawn from the title of the manuscript at Lambeth

inclined to believe that by "the book and platform," "the particular draught made for England with a new form of Common Praier therein prescribed," Bancroft here means simply the "booke of the forme of common prayers," of which he speaks elsewhere as "containing in it the effect of their whole pretended discipline": an expression which is warranted by the general character, language, and structure of the book, by the chapters contained in it under the titles—"The Order of Electing Ministers, Elders, and Deacons," "The Weekly Assembly (or Consistory) of the Ministers and Elders," and "An Order of Ecclesiastical Discipline"; and also by a paragraph relating to "Meetings, Conferences, and Synods of Ministers and Elders," &c., with which it closes: while further proposals in regard to matters of Ecclesiastical Discipline may have been embodied in the Bill by which on each occasion this Book was accompanied<sup>1</sup>. Thus the "Book of Discipline," the "*Disciplina Ecclesiæ Sacra*," may be thought to represent

in the Catalogue there: "*Formula Disciplina Sacræ ex Dei Verbo descriptæ a Presbyterianis Regina Elizabethæ et Parlamento offerendæ*"; and from the title written by Archbp. Sancroft in the volume of MSS. and quoted on p. 69. For the writers of these designations seem to have regarded the "Book of Discipline" as a work intended to be presented or offered to the Queen and Parliament: they do not speak of it as actually so offered. The expression may perhaps explain Bancroft's words in the passage just quoted: "there wanted not diverse solicitors, for the admittance of it": though that expression may probably have related to a somewhat earlier form of the "Book of Discipline."

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was written the writer has found confirmation of this point and of the view taken here in a manuscript in Dr. Williams' Library in Gordon Square.—In the important collection of manuscripts marked B (vol. i. pp. 247–251), and also in the volume of transcripts marked C (pp. 821, seq.), the volumes of which an account is given by Professor Lorimer in *John Knox and the Church of England*, pp. 245–250, there is a paper entitled "A Bill for the further Reformation of the Church offered with the Booke in the Parliament, An<sup>o</sup>.

1587."—The main part of the document so described is a long indictment of the existing polity of the Church, a plea for the Presbyterian polity, and a censure of the Prayer Book. At the end comes the petition "that it may be enacted by your Majesty with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, that the Booke hereunto annexed containing the things aforesaid, and entituled a Booke of the form of Common Prayer, &c., and everything therein contained may be from henceforth authorized, put in ure and practise, throughout all your Majesty's dominions, any former Law, Custom, or Statute to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding."—The content of the phrase, "the things aforesaid," is shown by the preceding sentence to be "A godly and seemly order of Common and public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, Solemnization of Marriages, visiting of the sick and burial of the dead, and for the guidance and direction of the Causes of the Church, and for the electing, ordering, and deposing of Ministers, and other necessary officers of the Church, and for the due manner of Execution of Church Censures and of the Conference and Synods of

that which the "platform of Discipline" gradually came to be, after it had been "severed from the saide book of Common praier": after it had become a scheme of order and government by which the Puritans might be held together, and on which they might secretly construct their Presbyterian organization, waiting for a more favourable time to seek open acceptance and authority for it.

## APPENDIX V.

### *The Editions of Hooker's treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity.*

A. The *Editio Princeps* containing (1) The first four books, which were entered at Stationers' Hall on January 29, 1592<sup>1</sup>, with the formal sanction of the Archbishop of Canterbury<sup>1</sup>: sent to the Lord Treasurer (Burghley) on March 13, 1592<sup>2</sup>: published in 1594<sup>3</sup>. On the title-page prefixed to these first four books there is no date: eight books are announced (as in the entry of Jan. 29, at Stationers' Hall): the printer's name is John Windet<sup>4</sup>, "dwelling at the signe of the "Crosse Keyes neere Powles Wharffe<sup>5</sup>." (2) The Fifth Book, printed by John Windet from the manuscript now in the Bodleian Library,

"the Ministers, with other like points  
"of Ecclesiastical Discipline, agree-  
"able both to God's most holy Word,  
"and to the best Reformed Churches."  
(Cf. also a MS. in the British Museum, Lansdowne, 119: p. 106.)  
—This Bill is, in the manuscript volume C, followed by an undated "Act for the Establishing of a Booke  
"entituled a form of Common Prayer  
"and Administration of the Sacra-  
"ments to be used in the Church of  
"England, with a Confession of faith  
"annexed in the beginning thereof."—  
It seems impossible to read these descriptions and to think that they refer to the Book of Discipline: and unreasonable to think that "A Booke  
"of the Form of Common Prayer" offered to the Parliament in 1584 was different in kind from the Book offered

under the same title in 1584. Cf. also Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, Book iii. Chapters 10 and 17.

<sup>1</sup> The entry is quoted in Keble's *Hooker*, I. xiii. note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Strype's *Life of Whitgift*, ii. 148; Keble's *Hooker*, i. 116.

<sup>3</sup> The authorities for this date are Walton, in his *Life of Hooker* (Keble's *Hooker*, i. 69); Strype, in his *Life of Whitgift* (ii. 148, 199), and the occasional insertion of the date in contemporary handwriting (Keble's *Hooker*, I. xiv. note 1).

<sup>4</sup> Probably a cousin of Hooker's. Cf. Keble's *Hooker*, I. lxxvi.

<sup>5</sup> "The price of this book was  
"three shillings, as appears from a  
"manuscript book of expences in the  
"reign of Elizabeth." Douce's manu-  
script note in a copy of Herbert's

sanctioned by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and published in 1597, that date appearing on the title-page.

B. The very scarce edition of 1604: containing (1) The first four books, reprinted by John Windet and bearing the date 1604 on their title-page, having prefixed to them a letter "to the Reader," by Dr. John Spenser<sup>1</sup>, in which this edition is spoken of as the *second*: and mention is made of "a purpose of setting forth the three last books also, their "father's Posthumi." (2) The fifth book, exactly as it appeared in 1597, with the same title-page, the same obvious misprints, the same list of "faults escaped in the printing of this part." "The truth seems "to be that Spenser only reprinted the four first books, to bind up "with the remaining copies of the fifth<sup>2</sup>."

C. The edition of 1611<sup>3</sup>: containing the first five books, printed by William Stansby, with pagination, for the first time, continuous through all the books: the general title-page is engraved and bears no date: in Dr. John Spenser's letter "to the Reader" this edition also is spoken of as the *second*, though the letter is in entirely different type and form from that of 1604: there is an elaborate and curious border round the table of the things handled in the eight books: on the new title-page prefixed to the fifth book the date is given, "Anno Dom. 1611": and, after the name of the printer, William Stansby, it is added that the books "are to be sold by *Matthew Lownes* at his Shop in Pauls Church-yard."

D. The edition of 1617, 1616: the engraved general title-page (similar to that of the preceding edition) bears the date 1617, after the words "Printed by Will: Stansby, and are to be sold by Mat: Lownes": Dr. Spenser's letter "to the Reader" speaks of this as the *fourth* edition: the new title-page to the fifth book bears the date 1616: the pagination is continuous through the five books. Then, after the fifth

Ed. of Ames' *Typographical Antiquities* (in the Bodleian Library), ii. 1230. For an account of Windet, v. *ibid.* p. 1223.

<sup>1</sup> An intimate friend of Hooker's, brother-in-law to his great friend George Cranmer, at C. C. C. with Hooker, and afterwards President of the College. Cf. Fowler, *History of Corpus Christi College*, 143, 4: 170-175. For the evidence that the letter "to the Reader" is his, Cf. Walton's *Appendix to the Life of*

Hooker (Keble's *Hooker*, i. 92). It must therefore be by a printer's error that the initials at the end of the letter are, in the edition of 1604, T. S. In the subsequent editions they are J. S. — Hooker's "Advertisement to the Reader," printed at the end of the fourth book in 1594, apologizing for the separate publication of these four books, is retained in 1604.

<sup>2</sup> Keble's *Hooker*, I. lvii.

<sup>3</sup> This edition was not, apparently, known to Mr. Keble.

book come (with a fresh title-page, dated 1618, and bearing the words "Printed for Henrie Fetherstone.") "Certayne Divine Tractates, and "other Godly Sermons": viz. (a) Walter Travers' "Supplication" with Hooker's "Answer": preceded by a letter "to the Reader," signed W. S. (probably William Stansby): (b) "A Learned Discourse of "Justification," by Hooker: with a letter "to the Christian Reader," signed by Henry Jackson<sup>1</sup>: (c) Three Learned Sermons, Of the Nature of Pride<sup>2</sup>, Against Sorrow and Fear, and Of the certainty and perpetuity of Faith in the Elect: (d) Two Sermons upon Part of St. Jude's Epistle<sup>3</sup>: with a prefatory letter, headed "To the Worshipfull "M. George Summaster, Principall of Broad-Gates Hall in Oxford, "Henry Jackson wisheth all happinesse."—All these tractates and sermons had already appeared during the years 1612, 1613: they are collected for the first time in this edition of 1618, with continuous pagination, though with a fresh (but similar) title-page prefixed to each of the four groups, a, b, c, and d.

E. The Edition of 1622; printed by W. Stansby. The contents are the same as those of the preceding Edition: but the pagination is continuous, throughout the five books and the tractates, &c. Dr. John Spenser's letter "to the Reader" speaks of this as the *Sixth* Edition: the engraved general title-page bears no date: the title-pages prefixed to the fifth book and to each of the four groups of tractates, &c., bear date 1622: and there are added two Alphabetical Tables of Contents, one referring to the first four books, the other to the fifth book, the tractates, &c.

F. In the British Museum there is another Edition, printed by W. Stansby, to be sold by George Latham, designated in Dr. Spenser's letter "to the Reader" as the *sixth*, bearing on the engraved title-page at the beginning no date: on the title-page of Bk. V, 1632: on the title-pages of some of the tractates, 1631.

There seems no need to carry further than this the designation of the successive editions: nor would it be in place here to notice at any length the publication in 1648 of a small quarto volume, claiming to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Keble's Hooker, I. xxxi, xxxii: Fowler, History of Corpus Christi College, 170, 3, 4.

<sup>2</sup> This Sermon is here left incomplete: cf. Keble's Hooker, I. liii, liv; III. 610, note 1.

<sup>3</sup> "There may appear on minute

"examination more internal reason  
"for questioning the genuineness of  
"these two sermons than of any thing  
"besides which bears the name of  
"Hooker."—Keble's Hooker, Editor's  
Preface, I. lv. Cf. *infra*, p. 265.

give the world "a work long expected," the sixth and eighth books of Hooker's great work<sup>1</sup>. But it may be convenient briefly to characterize, for purposes of reference, four other editions in which the Fifth Book has appeared.

G. Gauden's pretentious and slovenly volume, claiming to contain all Hooker's works. It was "printed by J. Best, for Andrew Crook, "at the Green Dragon in S. Paul's Church-yard" in 1662, and dedicated to Charles II<sup>2</sup>. It contains in addition to all that had been before published, the seventh book, and a very inaccurate life of Hooker by Bishop Gauden, which was happily superseded three years later, in 1665, by Izaak Walton's Life.

H. An edition in two volumes<sup>3</sup> (London, 1825), by the Rev. W. Dobson. Of this (which the present writer has not examined) Mr. Keble speaks as "a great improvement on all that had been done since "Gauden": and he took it, in preparing his own edition, "as the "groundwork on which to introduce the readings from the MSS. or "original editions."

I. The edition published in 1830, by Benjamin Hanbury, in three volumes, with copious, controversial, and often interesting notes. The edition is noteworthy as the work of an enthusiastic Non-Conformist: as an endeavour to recall the text of the Ecclesiastical Polity to a closer accord with that given in the early editions: and as embodying (1) the whole (though not in consecutive order) of the famous and rare tract entitled A Christian Letter, published in 1599; (2) Dr. Covel's Just and Temperate Defence of the Five Books of Ecclesiastical Polity, which appeared in 1603 in answer to the Christian Letter; and also (4) a Life of Thomas Cartwright, by the Editor.

K. Mr. Keble's edition; which appeared first (K<sup>1</sup>) in 1836, and most lately (K<sup>7</sup>) in 1888 (revised afresh for its seventh issue). The patient work which Mr. Keble devoted to his task during six laborious years may be seen in Sir John Coleridge's Memoir: and the seventh edition of the three volumes was enriched by Dean Church as only one who had read widely and constantly could enrich it. The present

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *infra*, Appendix VII.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Keble's Hooker, I. xxxix-xliv, lviii.

<sup>3</sup> The first 8vo edition was, according to Mr. Keble, that printed at the Clarendon Press in 1793. In it

appeared for the first time the letter from Bp. Andrewes to Dr. Parry, written a few days after Hooker's death.—Cf. Keble's Hooker, I. 91, note 1.

writer can simply say that, but for the change which Mr. Keble's learning and diligence have made in the conditions under which Hooker is studied, he could not have thought of undertaking the trust which was offered to him by the Delegates of the Press; the trust which it was at one time hoped Dean Church might have borne: and which this volume represents a partial attempt to discharge.

To this enumeration of the principal editions in which the fifth book of Hooker's great treatise has appeared, it may be here added that the manuscript occasionally referred to in this volume is one which was bought for the Bodleian Library by the Rev. H. O. Coxe in 1878 (Bodl. Addit. C. 165). It is believed to be the only known manuscript of the fifth book; and it is clearly that from which in 1597 the book was first printed. It was written by a clerk: but Hooker's own hand may be unmistakably recognized in many of the marginal notes: and on the first page is Whitgift's signature, giving authority for the publication. A fuller account of the manuscript is prefixed to the fifth book.

## APPENDIX VI.

### *Hacket's Conspiracy.*

On July 16, 1591, about ten o'clock in the forenoon, two gentlemen named Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthington gathered a great crowd round them, by going, from a house at Broken Wharf, along Watling Street towards Cheapside, proclaiming that Christ Jesus was come, with His fan in His hand, to judge the earth; that He was there in the house that they had just left by Broken Wharf; and that England must repent.—He who had sent them with this message, and whom they thus announced as the Messiah, was a certain William Hacket, an illiterate man accused of dissolute and violent ways, intimate with one Giles Wigginton, a deprived minister.—When Coppinger and Arthington reached Cheapside, finding themselves hemmed in by the crowd, they mounted an empty cart which chanced to be standing there, and preached to the people about the office and calling of

Hacket : how he represented Christ, how he was to sever the good from the bad, establish the Gospel in Europe, and bring in the Discipline : how he was King of Europe, from whom all Kings must hold : that Arthington was his prophet of judgement and Coppinger his prophet of mercy : and that the Queen had forfeited her Crown and was worthy to be deposed. The crowd simply staring at them, and at the same time making it impossible for them to go, as they had meant, to other parts of the City, they went into the Mermaid Tavern in Cheapside : and thence they presently found their way to Coppinger's lodging near Paul's Wharf, Arthington going on, with a mob after him, to the house where they had left Hacket ; who meanwhile had been to visit Wigginton.

The news of the tumult travelled quickly : and by about one o'clock Hacket, Arthington, and Coppinger had been arrested and taken to the Lord Mayor's. Several days were spent in examining them, Hacket being tortured, and on July 26 sentenced to death. On the 28th he was hanged and quartered, many circumstances adding to the horror and hideousness of the scene : and the following day Coppinger died in prison, having, it was said, starved himself to death. Arthington was spared, and in 1592 published a very strange statement of his repentance and submission, with an entreaty for pardon, and some poetry.

The preliminaries of the crazy venture, as told in the various accounts of it, are very curious : but it is chiefly to be studied in regard to the attempt which has been often made to lay some part of the blame on Cartwright and on the leaders of the Puritans.—It is certain that the three conspirators were all forward and vehement in the cause of the Discipline : that the liberation of Cartwright and of those who were with him in prison at that time was a part of their purpose : that they had constantly followed after Preachers of Puritan convictions : that they wrote, though vaguely, to Cartwright and to others of like mind in regard to what they had in hand ; that they regarded Cartwright as the greatest champion of the cause which they were raised up to forward : and that in the public opinion of the time their sedition told against the Puritan movement. But there seems no just reason for thinking that Cartwright or anyone like Cartwright gave them any encouragement at all, either directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication.—There is good ground for thinking that they were all three more or less insane : though it is impossible to say how far conceit and wilfulness and lack of self-restraint made them so, or what they might have been with wiser and more temperate teaching. The

only point in regard to which some blame may perhaps be thought to rest with the Puritan ministers who were informed in mysterious terms of "a strange and extraordinary course," likely to be followed by wonderful great effects, and of a calling "specially to deal with "Magistrates," is that they did not take active measures to keep those who so wrote to them from doing mischief. That some tried to discourage Coppinger is clear: whether all that could have been done to check him and his associates was done, is not quite clear. But this is no fair ground for a grave charge.

Books and pamphlets by contemporary writers treating of the affair are:—Conspiracie for Pretended Reformation; Ultimo Septembris, 1591: published anonymously, but *by authority* (1592): afterwards reprinted with the name of the author, Richard Cosin, Dean of the Arches and Official Principal to Archbishop Whitgift; The Seduction of Arthington, by Arthington himself, 1592; Dangerous Positions and Proceedings, by Bishop Bancroft, but published anonymously, 1593; A Brief Apologie of Thomas Cartwright against all such Slaunderous Accusations as it pleaseth Mr. Sutcliffe . . . to loade him with, 1596; which is largely quoted in Sutcliffe's Examination of M. Thomas Cartwright's late Apologie, 1596. Cf. also Bacon's Observations upon a Libel (1592), in Resuscitatio, p. 93: G. Cranmer's Letter to Hooker (1598), pp. 600-602: and note on VIII. iv. 1, in Keble's Hooker, Vol. III. pp. 368, 369. For later narratives, Fuller's Church History, Bk. ix. §§ 32-39; Camden's History of Elizabeth, pp. 451-454 (ed. 1675); Heylyn's History of the Presbyterians, Bk. ii. §§ 5-10; Strype's Annals, Vol. IV. xlvi, xlvii. pp. 68-72.

## APPENDIX VII.

### *The last Three Books of the treatise, and the Opuscula.*

An adequate account of the history, credentials, character, and contents of Books VI, VII, and VIII as they stand in Mr. Keble's edition, and of the minor works there printed with them, would hardly come within the scope of this volume. The present writer thought of giving a short account: but he has found it beyond his power to condense into any intelligible form the copious matter involved. All,

therefore, that will be here essayed is such a statement as may show with what confidence and with what reserves they may be referred to for the elucidation of the Fifth Book :—a statement which will rest to a great extent on Mr. Keble's admirable treatment of the critical questions in the preface to his edition.

The last three Books of the treatise were not published until long after Hooker's death : the Sixth and Eighth Books are severed by more than half a century, the Seventh by more than sixty years, from the publication of the Fifth. There seems very little room for doubt that Hooker himself finished writing the Books and left the manuscript, when he died in 1600, substantially ready for publication. There seems to be "irresistible" evidence that within a few months after his death "the completed books were irrecoverably gone ; and all that "remained was to secure and arrange what was left of the rough drafts." The evidence affords some ground for the suspicion which quickly rose that those who disliked the contents of the Books had had to do with their disappearance or mutilation : but it cannot be said that the charge is definitely proved.

The three Books, then, as they are now extant, may be taken as representing the best that could be made of rough, unfinished, and incomplete papers, believed to be by Hooker, but never printed until he had been long dead and they had passed through several hands. It is certain that the main and most important part of the Sixth Book is wholly lost : it is probable that nearly the whole of what is now printed as the Sixth Book either formed no part of the treatise or was a fragment which Hooker intended to work in as a subordinate section : the Seventh Book rests on no external evidence save the affirmation of one untrustworthy witness : of the Eighth Book (which was already judged to need "polishing" and arranging in 1612<sup>1</sup>), a very careful critic writes, "Doubtless we are still far from having the book as Hooker "himself would have published it ; yet by the aid of this our MS." (the MS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin), "the *disjecta membra* "are somewhat more decently arranged than before<sup>2</sup>." Thus the last three Books, in regard to their character and authority, stand in a position widely different from that of the previous five, which were all published before Hooker's death, and prepared for the press by him : and it may reasonably be brought into question whether they may safely be used as throwing light on his teaching. But the internal evidence, meeting and supplementing the external, seems to make up

<sup>1</sup> Keble's Hooker, Editor's Preface, p. xxxii.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Cotton, quoted in Keble's Hooker, Editor's Preface, § 22.

an ample warrant for so using them; provided that the use does not extend to laying stress on the particular turn of an isolated phrase: since this is what Hooker's final revision might well have led him to alter. The internal evidence is stronger, or, as Mr. Keble accounts it, "even "more decisive," in regard to the Seventh Book than in regard to the Sixth and Eighth: that is to say, it is at its best where it is most needed. But throughout it seems to be sufficient: and the traits of likeness to Hooker's deliberate work may be said to be even reinforced, as arguments of authenticity, by the traits of unlikeness: since the incompleteness of the Books as they now stand, the instances of repetition in them, the occasional asperity or loss of dignity in the style are in accordance with the belief that they were edited from what could be secured of Hooker's rough drafts after the disappearance of his finished work<sup>1</sup>.—Altogether, there seems no reason to doubt that the Books represent his work: though it is in a form in which he would never have let it come abroad.

The Opuscula differ somewhat widely in clearness of authenticity and intrinsic value. It can hardly be doubted that the Answer to Travers, together with Travers' Supplication to the Council, is genuine. The two were printed in 1612; they are well accredited, and bear ample tokens of authenticity. They carry with them into the list of genuine works Sermon I (on the Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect), and Sermon II (the Learned Discourse of Justification), both printed in 1612: for these contain passages complained of in Travers' Supplication and defended in Hooker's Answer: they are knit into the history of the controversy at the Temple: and the former of the two is well worthy of Hooker. Part of what is entitled Sermon III (Of the Nature of Pride) was printed in 1612, the rest was first published by Mr. Keble in 1836, from a MS. in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The work seems to the present writer to be below Hooker's level, lacking somewhat of his power, brilliancy, tenacity of theme, and sense of order: but it is clearly marked by some of his characteristic thoughts, and it is hardly to be severed from Sermons I and II, with which it apparently formed part of a long course of Sermons on the prophecy of Habakkuk: and it is moreover accredited by the testimony of Archbishop Ussher.—The Funeral Sermon (Sermon IV) was printed in 1612, and has in it points of close affinity with Hooker's mind: Sermon VII (on St. Matthew vii. 7, 8), published by Walton as Hooker's in 1678, and described as "found in the study of the late

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the account given in Gauden's Preface, quoted in Keble's Hooker, Editor's Preface, § 18, note 1.

"learned Bishop Andrewes," seems to show, save at the beginning, but little of the distinction of Hooker's work.—Weakest of all in internal evidence are the two Sermons upon part of St. Jude's Epistle (Sermons V and VI). Mr. Keble sums up, in § 27 of his Preface, their intrinsic tokens of unlikeness to Hooker's work.—An expression in Sermon V. § 15 seems to fix the date of that Sermon either in 1582 or in 1594: the earlier of these dates,—at which Hooker was under thirty, and may perhaps have been writing as he never could have written in his maturity,—seems barred by a reference in the same section to a book published in 1583<sup>1</sup>. But if it follows that the Sermon was written in 1594, it may fairly be said further to follow that some one else than Hooker wrote it.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Keble's *Hooker*, vol. i. p. lvi; vol. iii. pp. 675, 7.

OXFORD  
PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
BY HORACE HART, M.A.  
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY







